

1516. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Anchorage, Ky., favoring increase of pensions to Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1517. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of four citizens of Ringgold County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1518. Also, petition of 31 citizens of Cedar County, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1519. Also, petition of 14 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1520. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1521. Also, petition of 68 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1522. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1523. Also, petition of 75 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1524. Also, petition of 35 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1525. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1526. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1527. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1528. Also, petition of 40 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1529. Also, petition of 42 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1530. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Charles O. Butler and other citizens of Cheshire, Conn., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1531. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of the eighth congressional district of Michigan urging early action on a bill granting more liberal pensions to Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1532. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of Carter County (Ky.) citizens on Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1533. Also, petition of Lawrence County (Ky.) citizens against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1534. By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Petition from sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1535. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill looking to granting increase of pensions to veterans of that war and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 13, 1928

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 11, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

LXIX—90

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McMahan	Shortridge
Bingham	George	McNary	Smoot
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Steck
Blaine	Gillett	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Borah	Gould	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Thomas
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Tydings
Bruce	Hawes	Overman	Tyson
Capper	Hayden	Phipps	Wagner
Caraway	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Curtis	Jones	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Cutting	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Deneen	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Dill	King	Sackett	
Edge	La Follette	Schall	

Mr. JONES. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in a hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. My colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REFUND OF PASSPORT FEES ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, requesting that section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," Sixty-ninth Congress, session 1, approved July 3, 1926, Public No. 493, be amended so as to authorize the refund of passport fees erroneously collected otherwise than under the existing authority contained in that section.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State, and I therefore request of the Congress legislation amending section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926, in the sense suggested.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 13, 1928.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE (S. DOC. NO. 40)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that legislation be enacted to provide funds to cover the expense of this Government's participation in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference to be held at Habana commencing March 31, 1928. The Secretary of State sets forth in his letter the reasons why it is considered advisable that the United States be represented at this conference.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State that this Government should participate in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference, and therefore request of the Congress legislation appropriating \$5,000 for each and every expense connected with the representation of the United States at that conference, including travel, subsistence, or per diem in lieu thereof in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), and compensation of employees as the Secretary of State shall consider necessary and authorize in his discretion.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 13, 1928.

ELECTRIC-POWER INDUSTRY—SUPPLY OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT AND COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 329, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session (agreed to February 9, 1925), a report

of the commission on the electric-power industry, Volume II, entitled "Supply of Electrical Equipment and Competitive Conditions."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This is the second volume of the report made in obedience to a resolution of the Senate. The first volume has been printed and is available to Senators. I think the report ought to go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SMOOT. That is where the other went, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY PROJECT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the chief engineer of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, also signed by a board of consulting engineers, and accompanied by a report by the board, together with a letter by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs briefly explaining the situation, which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year 1927, with the operations for the month of December only estimated, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I send to the desk telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions, together with copy of a response I have made relative to an increased tariff duty on onions. I ask that my letter be printed in the RECORD and that the names of the petitioners and the various organizations be noted, but not necessarily that the papers be printed in full. I ask that the telegrams and letters be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PHIPPS presented telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions from the Montrose County Chamber of Commerce, R. L. Loesch, secretary; H. A. Stevens, president; and H. B. Coffman, secretary, of a meeting of onion growers and dealers, held in Olathe; the Uncompaghe Valley Water Users' Association, by B. S. Tobin, acting secretary, and the Montrose Lions Club, by Walter P. Crose, president, all in the State of Colorado, praying for an increased tariff duty on onions, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter of response of Mr. PHIPPS on the subject is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 12, 1928.

Hon. JOHN F. BETHUNE,
Secretary United States Tariff Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thanking you for your letter of January 11, transmitting notice of a public hearing next month on the production costs of onions, your records will show that I have earnestly urged an increased tariff duty on this important farm commodity. On August 15 last I presented letters and resolutions from citizens of Olathe, Colo., and later took up this matter with the commission in person, calling attention to the serious situation in Montrose County, and to telegrams from the chamber of commerce, the Olathe Onion Growers and Dealers' Association, the Uncompaghe Valley Water Users' Association, the Montrose Lions' Club, and others interested.

In view of the pending tariff resolution I am now calling such messages to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, and the extreme necessity for a more adequate protective duty on onions has also been presented personally to the President of the United States.

I desire to impress upon your commission the gravity of the existing situation, especially in the West, as well as the need for raising a higher tariff wall against excessive importations of this important farm commodity. I deeply regret that the commission has found it impossible to recommend an increased duty on onions prior to this time, and sincerely trust that definite action will be expedited in every proper way. Farmers in my State, especially on the western slope, are deeply interested. Will you be so kind, therefore, as to consider this letter as their formal request for early and favorable action on the pending application, and to include their views in the hearings to be held early next month.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to amend the river and harbor act so as to provide for maintenance of a uniform stage of water in the headwaters of the Mississippi River throughout the year

Whereas the river and harbor act passed by Congress in 1880 provided for the creation of storage reservoirs to impound the high waters of the Mississippi River during the spring and early summer, and to release them during the late summer and fall, so as to produce a greater flow in said river during the low-water season in the interests of navigation, and disregarding the conservation and propagation of fish life in the headwaters of the Mississippi; and

Whereas the raising and lowering of the water in the storage reservoirs created by the War Department under said act has resulted in destroying much of the natural feeding, resting, and breeding grounds of migratory birds, and has affected the value of the property of riparian owners, and interfered with the natural propagation of game fish, and has resulted in the freezing of many thousands of game fishes in shallow bays during the winter months: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That Congress be, and it hereby is, memorialized to so amend said river and harbor act that the wild life of the State of Minnesota may be protected and propagated, and that said act be amended so as to provide for the maintenance of a uniform stage of water or a definite, fixed, and permanent low-water level in said headwaters throughout the year; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States and to each Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN A. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. I. NOLAN,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 9th day of March, 1927.

JOHN I. LEVIN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 10th day of March, 1927.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved March 11, 1927.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON, Governor.

Filed March 11, 1927.

MIKE HOLM, Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office March 11, 1927.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM, Secretary of State.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Whereas the people of the Nation are not unmindful of the service rendered by the valiant men and women of the country who served in the various branches of the national defense during the World War; and

Whereas it is the universal expectation and desire of all right-thinking people of the Nation that those men and women who sustained disabilities during their service either at home or abroad shall be properly compensated for their injuries and handicaps they sustained; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has created the United States Veterans' Bureau, charged with administrative duty of awarding and paying compensation to the Nation's defenders who sustained handicaps, nervous, physical, and mental disabilities, resulting from their military service; and

Whereas millions of citizens of the States and Territories of the Union were accepted or called by draft by the Federal Government into military service for the defense of the Nation and its ideals; and

Whereas upon receiving honorable discharge from the military service, said men and women automatically reverted to their prior status as citizens of their respective States and Territories; and

Whereas the United States Veterans' Bureau is depriving thousands of disabled ex-service men and women and their dependents and beneficiaries of the benefits which Congress has provided for them and is, in contravention of the Bill of Rights of our Federal and State Constitutions, "adjudicating" numerous veterans who are suffering from nervous disabilities, insane, and mentally incompetent who are not incompetent, without granting them a "day in court" to defend their liberties and civil rights for the obvious purpose of enabling petty officials of the bureau to dictate the appointment of their own nominee

as guardians, curators, and conservators to receive the compensation award to which such veterans are entitled through the promulgation of erroneous legal decisions and to intricate and insurmountable rules and regulations and requirements: Be it therefore

Resolved (the senate concurring herein)—

SECTION 1. That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be petitioned to use their best efforts in an endeavor to bring about a change in the laws of the United States as necessary to adequately protect the liberty and civil rights of all disabled World War veterans who are suffering from nervous disabilities and who may hereafter apply to the United States Veterans' Bureau for the relief which has been provided for them by the Congress responsive to the desires of the people of this Nation.

SEC. 2. That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be petitioned to use their best efforts in an endeavor to bring about a change in conditions in the United States Veterans' Bureau to the end that those former service men and women of the World War having service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities may be promptly compensated.

SEC. 3. That a copy of this concurrent resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to Gen. Frank T. Hines, and Hon. William Wolf Smith, director and general council, respectively, of the United States Veterans' Bureau, Washington, D. C.; to Mr. William J. Winn, department commander of the Arkansas Department, American Legion; to Mr. Thomas M. Kirby, chairman national rehabilitation committee, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; to Mr. Watson B. Miller, chairman national rehabilitation committee, the American Legion, Bond Building, Washington, D. C.; and to Mr. Edwin S. Bettelheim, chairman Veterans of Foreign Wars, Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C.

February 25. Read and approved.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from Hugh W. Wicker, adjutant, the American Legion, of Little Rock, Ark., praying for the making of a small appropriation from which funds may be drawn for cigarettes and necessary clothing for veterans who are hospitalized and who are not drawing compensation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 1285) to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 75) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2277) relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 76) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2524) for the relief of Josephine Doxey; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2525) granting the consent of Congress for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Delaware River from the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to Gloucester County, N. J.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 2526) for the relief of Sheldon R. Purdy; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2527) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Huston; and

A bill (S. 2528) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Scott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2529) for the relief of Mrs. L. E. Burton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2530) for the relief of W. O. Whipps (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2531) granting a pension to Charles L. Heintz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2532) to provide for the designation of clerks or employees of the Department of the Interior to serve as regis-

ters and receivers in the land offices in Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2533) to repeal the United States grain standards act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2534) authorizing the appropriation of \$65,000 to be expended by the American Section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, for the purpose of making a survey to fix the boundary between the United States and Mexico, between El Paso, Tex., and Fort Quitman, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 2535) granting to the State of New Mexico certain lands for reimbursement of the counties of Grant, Luna, Hidalgo, and Santa Fe for interest paid on railroad aid bonds, and for the payment of the principal of railroad aid bonds issued by the town of Silver City, and to reimburse said town for interest paid on said bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2536) to extend the time for which appropriations are authorized under the act entitled "An act to authorize the collection and editing of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the national archives," approved March 3, 1925; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 2537) to amend section 110, national defense act, so as to provide better administrative procedure in the disbursements for pay of National Guard officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 2538) for the construction of a road across the Makah Reservation to Neah Bay, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 2539) granting a pension to Pleasant R. W. Harris; and

A bill (S. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Webb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMOOT. I introduce a bill to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution, and at the same time I ask that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of and for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 1300, a bill for the same purpose but which requires amendment. Therefore I introduce a new bill and ask for the discharge of the committee and indefinite postponement of the bill (S. 1300) to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2541) to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Finance.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. PHIPPS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1274) to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed.

AVIATION FIELD IN ARIZONA

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent, as to Calendar No. 45, the bill (S. 1154) to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes, that it be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF SINKING OF THE SUBMARINE "S-4"

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131), providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine S-4, and upon methods and appliances for the protection of submarines, and I submit a report (No. 77) thereon.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator from Maine permit me to inquire what is the report he has just filed?

Mr. HALE. It is upon the joint resolution providing for an investigation into the submarine S-4 disaster.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The majority of the committee has filed a written report?

Mr. HALE. A written report.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And it will be printed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar and the report will be printed under the rule.

THE TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. McMASTER, favoring a reduction of tariff schedules and the consideration of tariff legislation at the present session of Congress.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, before we come to a vote on the pending resolution I desire to submit a few remarks. I have made the statement before that I do not recall any time when there have been so many problems before the country, but so few issues. The problems are many and they are complicated, but they do not strike a political difference that will amount to an issue such as has been the case in every period in the country's history since we have been a National Government. I might enumerate the problems which come before us and which are now pending, in which the parties on either side are as much or more divided among themselves than the parties are divided as between the original contestants.

There is probably to be found an explanation in that situation of our inability to arouse the public on matters of the franchise, because they are apt to say, "What is the difference?" There is really a great difference, however, between the parties on the subject now before us, the question of a protective tariff. I have noted in the last 20 years that difference growing less and less. It certainly is emphasized in the present resolution. It is offered by a Republican. The purport of the resolution is a lowering of the tariff. Just what the extent of that is to be no one knows. All the Senators who have spoken on the resolution on the opposite side of the aisle, except three, have supported the protective-tariff system in reference to particular items and have, therefore, expressed opposition to the resolution. If it is a matter pertaining to the manufacture of straw hats, the State which is employed in that business, represented by a distinguished Democrat, is protected in its interests by the representative speaking against the resolution because he wants protection on that item, to say nothing about other items which have not been mentioned. If the matter pertains to vegetable oils, there are Democratic representatives of the State who will speak on behalf of protection upon those articles.

If it is a case of citrus fruits coming from Florida the distinguished representatives of that State speak for protection. So I could go on and enumerate the various interests that have contended here on behalf of the protective tariff when it is to apply to particular articles. I am not criticizing those who have taken such a position with respect to particular items. The criticism that I offer is that a consistent attitude, it seems to me, would not permit a Senator to speak for protection for an article that his State produces and against protection for an article that other States produce, provided the articles sought to be protected come in competition with foreign imports; in other words, it is a sort of "spotted" protection theory that favors protection for the one article growing in a particular State, but free trade for other articles that are not produced by that State.

So I think I am justified in the statement that the difference between the political parties on this one issue is becoming less and less; in fact, I believe that the southern section of the country, as it becomes a great manufacturing section, will gradually become more and more adherent to the protective theory.

There might be some occasion for surprise in that the author of this resolution comes from a great agricultural State. It is a surprise to me, and as I have listened to the arguments of the proponents of the resolution, especially those who are on this side of the aisle, I think there is an element that is unfortunate to the extent that there is indicated more or less of defiance or of a feeling of retaliation, "We are going to get even; there has been discrimination, it is alleged; and in order that we may relieve these discriminations we are going to do certain things, no matter what may be the ultimate result." I am convinced that such is a very unfortunate plane for a legislative body to operate upon.

This is a very broad principle and the subject should be discussed as a matter of principle. Any suggestion that "we are going to have what we want, no matter what effect it may have upon the general public, or else we are going to pull the house down over our own heads" is like cutting off one's nose in order to spite one's face. I know of no situation that is better expressed by that aphorism than the situation that arises here.

The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in my judgment, developed the fundamental proposition that is at the foundation of all tariff legislation, and I believe that he did not make it as strong as the facts will warrant. We are not only coming to be an agriculturally importing country but we are going to reach that condition much sooner than many Senators to-day believe. It is not only because we are in competition with new countries producing the same things agriculturally that we are producing, but it is largely because we are increasing our consumptive power in a marvelous manner without necessarily increasing the acreage tillable in agricultural production. Here is a source of production that is largely fixed; it can not be unlimitedly extended. Stress has been placed upon increasing production to the acre rather than increasing acreage. We have had that emphasis for the last 20 years upon the basis that we have an unlimited, increasingly growing consumptive need, while we have a fixed rather than a growing productive ability. The number of acres susceptible of production is not to be greatly increased, for it is more or less a fixed area, while the consumption needs are bound to increase.

Without an increase of acreage and with an increase of consumptive needs we must increase the production per acre. On that necessity emphasis has been laid for 20 years. As a result of that emphasis we have come to the point where that fixed acreage is producing a surplus which is growing less and will continue to grow less every year, which is inevitable. Before many years consumptive needs, unlimited in character except ability to buy, will be demanding a supply that our country will not be sufficiently productive to meet. Then comes the importation and its competition just as certainly as we are in this Chamber; that inevitable law of increasing needs, with a fixed ability to produce, will compel us to look to other countries. That is the point that was emphasized yesterday by the senior Senator from Idaho. We are bound under existing conditions to become in time an importing country of agricultural products.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. As I understand the distinguished Senator from Ohio, he infers that there will soon be need of the importation of additional agricultural products, but that there are already agricultural products upon the free list which need protection. That was the central theme discussed yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Idaho when he delivered his very able speech upon this subject. If it be true that duties are needed upon certain agricultural products which come in free at the present time, that is the argument why this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, that introduces another phase that has been discussed here in more or less of a desultory manner, as to just what this resolution means; whether it contemplates a complete revision of the tariff or whether a revision to be confined according to the wording of the resolution. If it contemplates a revision of the tariff, meaning that rates may be reduced or rates may be increased, that is a different subject entirely. I would not be in favor, I will say to the Senator the author of the resolution, of undertaking a revision of the tariff at this time. I make that statement in order to answer an anticipated question as to whether, if the resolution were changed by incorporating merely the word "revision," I would support it. I could not support a proposal to-day to open up the question of the revision of the tariff, and I will state why in my own time.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SACKETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. The resolution in its present form states—

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive and that the Senate favors immediate revision downward of such schedules.

I will ask the Senator from South Dakota, if I may, would he not be willing to insert the word "excessive" after the word "such," in the third line, so that there would be no ambiguity? The resolution then would read as follows:

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive schedules.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the insertion of the word "excessive" after the word "such" in line 3. I think it would be superfluous, so far as that is con-

cerned, because the language itself is perfectly plain that it means a revision downward of those schedules which are excessive.

Mr. COPELAND. However, to make it clear so that there could be no doubt, would the Senator be willing to insert that word?

Mr. McMASTER. Yes, Mr. President; I would be perfectly willing, and I ask that that word be incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator. Now, may I ask the Senator from Ohio a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. I believe that the position of the Senator from Ohio is exactly the same as my own position. I would not be in favor of a universal or horizontal reduction of the tariff schedules, but if there are excessive schedules they should be reduced. I assume that the Senator from Ohio will concede, in the first place, that if there are such excessive schedules they should be reduced. Am I right?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator from Utah will wait just a moment until the Senator from Ohio answers the question.

Mr. FESS. Did the Senator from New York ask the Senator from Ohio that question?

Mr. COPELAND. I am speaking to the Senator from Ohio. If there are schedules which are excessive, does the Senator believe that they should be lowered?

Mr. FESS. If there are duties which are excessive, meaning by that unnecessary, of course I would be in favor, when the time comes to revise the tariff, of reducing them.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean by that that he would not be willing to do it now if it were demonstrated that they are excessive?

Mr. FESS. O Mr. President, the Senator from New York knows very well that talking about revision of the tariff under this resolution at this time is only a gesture. It is mere political "bunk," as the Senator knows, in an effort to provide campaign material for the approaching election. The Senator can not look me in the eye and suggest that he sincerely believes that there will be any effort during the present session of Congress to undertake a revision of the tariff schedules.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, Mr. President, if this is political "bunk," it is Republican political "bunk," because the pending resolution was presented by a Senator on his own side of the aisle. But I do not believe it is political "bunk"; I think it is a perfectly proper thing, if I may say so.

Mr. FESS. Yes; the Senator believes that the Senate of the United States is not performing a proper function when it is consuming the time in discussing a matter which the House probably will not consider at all and upon which it has to act first.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator is asking me a question, I will say that the Senate is performing a proper function when it attempts in any proper way to correct conditions which have interfered with the prosperity of agriculture. Of course, the Senate can not initiate tariff legislation, but certainly, if there are tariff schedules which are excessive and if it can be shown that those tariff schedules are excessive and that by reason of the fact that they are excessive agriculture is imperiled, it would seem to me that every Senator should do everything he could to make possible the revision of those schedules in order that agriculture may be relieved and put on a parity with the other industries of the country.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has a perfect right to express his views upon both sides of the question. He is on both sides. He is for protection. That will please the protectionists. He is against protection. That will please the free traders. He has a perfect right to his opinion. This is merely a gesture. There is not a person in this Chamber who believes for a second that this body has any right to deal with this subject from the beginning until a tariff bill comes over from the House. If we have nothing to do here except to talk, it is all right to proceed on that basis; but if we are to proceed regularly on tariff revision it must be admitted by every Senator that there is a way to do it, and that is the constitutional way. When it comes to that I will join in the consideration of the bill in the regular order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. FESS. The Senator from New York can make his speech in his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Ohio, having criticized the Senator from New York, would not wish to pass the matter over without permitting the Senator from New York to reply.

Mr. FESS. The Senator may reply in his own time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, very well, if the Senator declines to permit a reply.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised that this resolution should come from an agricultural State, from a representative of a great section of the country almost entirely confined to the production of agriculture. I was surprised first because it has been my understanding that agriculture is chiefly concerned not in the lowering of rates but in the increase of rates.

As has been stated here before, the very first act that was passed after the close of the war was the emergency tariff act. That was confined entirely to agricultural products. It enumerated 28 of them. There is not a single item in that bill that is not agricultural; and I state here, without fear of contradiction by anyone who knows the facts, that never in the history of this country had a tariff bill been brought before either body and seriously considered that was limited to only one industry until the introduction and consideration of that bill; and it was because the liquidation of the farm situation was most hurtful, and in order to meet it as soon as possible the whole legislation was limited to agriculture.

Then in September of the following year—this agricultural bill having passed in May, 1921—in September, 1922, it was very largely included in the regular, permanent tariff legislation.

I have consulted with the Tariff Commission upon the applications for changes in the tariff. I am amazed at the number of applications that have been made for an increase of the tariff. There have been very few applications for a decrease of the tariff. I have also noted that 40 per cent of the applications for increase are confined to agriculture, and here rises in this Chamber a representative of the great agricultural section and offers a resolution requiring the immediate consideration of the tariff for the purpose of lowering the tariff schedules when the very first and most important schedule would cover the subject of agriculture!

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. FESS. That is the reason why I was surprised to have this resolution come before us. Later on, after hearing the discussion of the author of the resolution and others who think with him, I came to the conclusion that they themselves are not seriously expecting that that will be done, but are offering the resolution simply as a suggestion that unless certain legislation is carried through looking to the improvement, in their view of the matter of agricultural conditions, there will be an onslaught on the whole industrial and agricultural fabric of the country. I do not think that is wise at all from any point of view.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. FESS. Now I yield to the author of the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. I appreciate very much the fact that the distinguished Senator from Ohio desires to assume responsibility for the reasons and the purposes of the introduction of this resolution. I am very glad to have him attempt to interpret those motives and those reasons, but I want to say to him that he is far off in his interpretation.

In the first place, there are many agricultural products upon which there are no duties, and no one is asking for a reduction of duties upon products of that kind. For example, there are hides, which are upon the free list. Furthermore, the language of this resolution—

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I want to pay some attention to the Senator's reference to hides. I want to give him some information on it.

Mr. McMASTER. May I continue my question?

Mr. FESS. No; wait until I finish this and then I will let the Senator continue his question.

Many times the Senator and others have mentioned the fact that hides are on the free list as a complaint against tariff legislation. I was in the other body at the time both the emergency tariff legislation and the permanent tariff legislation took place. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that in the Committee of the Whole we placed hides on the dutiable list, whereupon there was offered a very small compensatory duty upon shoes. Shoes are on the free list and have been for a considerable period of time, and that was one reason for putting hides on the free list—the raw material with the finished product.

The theory of protection is to protect to the extent of the difference in the cost of production. Naturally that must go to labor. Therefore when we come to consider protection, certainly where labor is employed, it will be important; and we considered that if hides were on the free list, in all probability shoes, also on the free list, might be produced in competition with foreign countries. With the raw material on the free list, the finished product was put on the free list.

When an amendment was offered putting hides on the dutiable list, I voted for it in the Committee of the Whole, and then voted for a small compensatory duty on shoes. When we got out of the Committee of the Whole, however, and the matter was submitted to the vote of the House to adopt what had been done in the Committee of the Whole, the House took off the compensatory duty on shoes. Then the House reversed the action of the committee and hides remained on the free list. Later, as the Senator will recall, there was an effort to put hides on the dutiable list in this body. I want the Senator simply to know that I favored putting hides on the dutiable list and voted for it.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator favors this resolution, then?

Mr. FESS. This resolution proposes to reduce and lower the tariff.

Mr. McMASTER. Oh, yes; it proposes to bring about a closer parity between agriculture and industry. Now, just a moment further.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator says—

Mr. McMASTER. May I continue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio further yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FESS. Not just now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator says his resolution proposes to bring about a parity between agriculture and industry, and at the same time he argues that the tariff has nothing to do with it. I do not understand that sort of argument.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield now?

Mr. FESS. I yield now.

Mr. McMASTER. It was very gratifying to me to hear the Senator from Ohio explain why hides were put upon the free list; that is to say, if hides were put upon the free list, then shoes should be put upon the free list.

Evidence has been compiled and data have been placed before the Finance Committee showing that if there were a 15 per cent ad valorem duty on hides it would not affect the price of shoes more than from 2½ to 4 cents a pair; so it was a perfectly square deal, then, to ask the farmers to furnish shoes for all of the population of America when that price was affected only by from 2 to 4 cents and permit their product to go on the free list! As a matter of fact a duty of 15 or 20 per cent upon hides has no significant part in the cost of the manufacture of shoes; and it does not make any difference to me what were the circumstances surrounding the action when hides were put upon the free list. They are upon the free list, and it does not make any difference who was responsible for it; it is time that they went back upon the dutiable list.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the observation made by the Senator was not the basis upon which the action was taken. There are 6,600,000 farmers. All of these farmers do not produce hides. Only a portion of them produce hides, but there are 115,000,000 people who wear shoes; and the question was whether shoes should go on the free list, because we had reached a point where, in the efficiency of our machinery and labor, we could compete with foreign manufacturers. It was therefore decided that since everybody wears shoes they should go on the free list, since protection was no longer needed. Then the question was whether the raw material that goes into the manufacture of shoes should go on the free list. A majority in both branches took that view.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio feel that that was an adequate excuse?

Mr. FESS. I do not. That is the reason why I did not vote for it.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator and I agree, then, on this proposition.

Mr. FESS. On that particular one.

Mr. McMASTER. That alone would justify this resolution.

Mr. FESS. Oh, no; I differ from the Senator about that alone, or any other consideration, justifying this resolution in this body.

Mr. President, next to the production of the farmer's product, his chief concern is where to sell that which he does not use on his farm. I do not speak of it as surplus, because that term applies to what we export to a foreign country. I speak

of the difference between what the farmer produces on his farm and what he consumes on his farm.

Every farmer consumes a small percentage of what he produces. He must look to some one who is not a farmer to consume what he himself does not consume. He can not sell to farmers, for they are producing the same thing he is producing. He must sell to people who are consumers, who are not engaged in the production of the same thing that he is producing. Therefore the chief concern of the producer on the farm is to find a place where people consume who are not farmers. There arises the supreme necessity of building up, on the part of the farmer, industry that is not engaged in farming. That is his only hope. Otherwise all that he could do would be to produce that which he lives upon, and he would have nowhere to sell the product which he wants to convert into money to pay taxes, insurance, interest, and the current expenses of the farm.

It seems to me that every agriculturist should have supreme in his mind a near-home market, as near as he could get it, and a market with great buying power. Otherwise, he has not any profit in what he does.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. I notice that the Senator, as all other Senators who oppose this resolution do, continually brings up the argument that the purport of this resolution is to destroy industry, to destroy the home market for agricultural products. All that this resolution purports to do, so far as industrial schedules are concerned, is to reduce excessive rates, and certainly no Member of the Senate can argue against reducing an excessive rate. If excessive rates are reduced, that protects every legitimate industry in America; it protects legitimate profits of every legitimate industry. That sort of an argument is entirely beside the question and outside of the purport of this resolution.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, that identical argument has been used by the opponents of protection ever since the Government has been organized. You never heard a free trader who would admit that he was willing to break down American industry. Never in my life have I heard one admit that. They always argue that the reduction of the tariff will not do it. We have the history of every Democratic revision of the tariff, that was to do away with the protective tariff, and that statement, every item of it, has been contradicted by the history of our country.

I have been through the Northwest, through the great State which the distinguished author of this resolution represents. I have been through the great State north of it, and through that empire State of Montana, a great producer of wheat and other agricultural articles, and when I talked to the citizens of North Dakota and of South Dakota I found they were not slow to say to me, "The thing we need is people. What we want are more people to consume what we produce, and if physically we could plant near the Dakotas a great center of population, not engaged in agriculture but in industry outside of agriculture, we would boost tremendously the prices of the products produced by the farmer of North Dakota."

But the farmer is compelled to ship his products from North and South Dakota to the Twin Cities in the one case and to the eastern part of the United States, which is the chief consumer, in the other case, and in both cases he suffers heavy transportation costs. Now my friend, whether he means it or not, is proposing to extend the market 3,000 miles across the sea instead of bringing it closer to the place where the farmer is producing his article.

I know the trite argument of the promoters of free trade. They say, "No; it will not destroy the home market; it will have very little effect upon the home market." I say to the distinguished author of this resolution that if you put the American producer of manufactured goods in competition with the cheap labor of Europe by reducing or destroying the tariff, you immediately will put out of employment at least 5,000,000 men in America, as has been done in other days, and when you drop 5,000,000 men from the pay roll you lose \$6,000,000,000 of consumptive power, and if you take out of the buying power of America \$6,000,000,000, what becomes of the home market for the products the farmers raise in South Dakota and elsewhere?

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. I am very much impressed by the able statements of the Senator from Ohio, but I remember that when I was in college I read that same kind of speech; but that was in the days when the two principles of free trade and protection were coming in competition with each other. That was back in the McKinley campaign. I remember reading that speech and

those arguments, and it was a splendid speech along those lines; but it has not a thing to do with the reduction of excess schedules in the present tariff law.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator is taking refuge under the word "excess," which has been placed in the resolution as a relief to him from the embarrassment of the original resolution. Nevertheless, the proposal is to tear down what we call the integrity of American business, built upon a system of protective tariff. "Unless," they say, "you are going to join with us on some method of bringing the two things together, we will pull the whole house down." That we are told over and over on this side of the aisle. That is the thing that you can not get away from, that if certain things are not going to be done, we are going to pull this fabric down over our heads, and then they say, "Let everybody suffer alike." What does that mean, to let everybody suffer alike? It means that what they appear to feel is a discrimination in tariff legislation in favor of industry as against the farmer, a discrimination intended in the law, that may be easily remedied by amending the law. That position is without foundation. We give to agriculture not only the same protection industry receives, but we give it adequate increased protection over industry.

Every person who is informed knows that the last tariff law, that of 1922, provides a lower percentage of protection on industry than on agriculture; the increased percentage of protection is in favor of agriculture instead of industry. In the face of these facts, we are told over and over that the tariff legislation is against the farmer, on behalf of industry, as if we are choosing industry as a favorite as against one of the greatest industries we have in the country, namely, agriculture.

That is an unfair statement. If the Senator would say that the farmer has not the facility to employ the tariff protection as easily as the manufacturer has, there might be some basis for the statement, but when we are charged in legislation that we favor industry, discriminating against agriculture, the facts belie that statement, for, on the other hand, the favor has been given to agriculture.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question there?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has, I think inadvertently, because I assume he wants to be entirely fair in his argument, assumed that there is a school in the Senate that is advocating free trade. I think the able Senator who is the author of the resolution before us negatives that very completely, and I ask the Senator if he does not remember that the Walker tariff law, which really was an expression of the economic and tariff philosophy of the Democratic Party, declared in 1846 that the tariff must be levied without discrimination against any section, or against any class, or against any product? The Senator recalls that Mr. Blaine pronounced that to be the greatest tariff act that was ever written, and the Senator must know that there is no one advocating free trade. I do not see why he constantly assumes that there is, because I assume that the Senator, as an educated man, must know that his arguments, in order to carry weight, must be founded and postulated upon facts, and not upon theories which have no foundation in fact.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, let me edify the Senator from Utah by a citation of some history on the tariff question. I had not intended to do that, but he invites it, and he needs it, judging from the statement he has just made.

The first act under the administration of Washington was a protective tariff act, in order to encourage manufactures, to build up a varied industry in this country, and to supply as far as possible a market for the farmer. The tariff became a subject of discussion at once. It was indorsed by Thomas Jefferson. It was indorsed by James Madison.

At the close of the War of 1812 there seemed to be a fear that cotton, which was then coming to be a great article of export, would be militated against if the protective system continued. Consequently there was an effort to repeal the system. Finally a compromise was reached in 1833, handled largely by Henry Clay. The author was quoted yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

In 1846 Robert J. Walker was the author of the famous Walker tariff law of that year, and it is the verdict of history that as soon as it took effect there was a general paralysis of the business of the country that was relieved only by two items. The first was the wide famine in China, which called for much of what we produced. The second was the Crimean War of 1853, which involved the three great empires of Europe in war. Those two items supplied a market not unlike the market of Europe in 1914, and America could sell at a good price everything she could produce. That was the relief from the paralyzing, death-dealing business policy of the Robert J. Walker tariff of 1846.

We have had tariff discussions from that on down to the present time. The famous tariff act, known as the Mills bill, was offered. Then came the tariff of 1893, under the leadership of Grover Cleveland. The inevitable results that followed that tariff act were paralysis of business, capital in hiding, labor out of employment, and general destruction of industry in the land, with a nation-wide suffering of all classes.

Then in 1896, with the country in an indescribable situation industrially, the Great Commoner came out of the West with the assurance that all our trouble was due to our money, that what we needed was silver coined at the ratio of 16 to 1, and he swept the country on the basis that the tariff had nothing to do with the situation, but that it was the money power. We went through that campaign of 1896.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to observe that Mr. Bryan swept the country in July and August, but McKinley swept the country in November.

Mr. FESS. The Senator is right. There is not a doubt in the world that if the election had been held in August, McKinley would not have been elected, but under a campaign of education, in which people began to think as to what would be the effect of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, that position was rejected, and immediately after the inauguration of McKinley in 1897 we had the Dingley bill of that year. Then, again, capital invested in industry, labor was employed at a steady and fairly high wage, and we secured relief from the death-dealing, business-destroying Democratic legislation of the former year.

We have the same thing coming up periodically. Whenever there is a depression in any section somebody comes along and suggests some artificial cure. We had it in the greenback movement of 1873. We had it again in the Populistic movement of 1890. We had it again in the free-silver movement in 1896. We had it last year from the same section upon the same basis, growing out of the same situation exactly—always some artificial method by the Government to cure economic ills. That is the one danger that I see in legislation on a fundamental subject such as the farm situation.

I am not going to quibble whether it is free trade or protection. I recognize that at one time it was tariff for revenue only. That was the Democratic theory. Then Samuel J. Randall came along, a protectionist, and he said "tariff for revenue only with incidental protection." Then we find Underwood coming along and it was "tariff competitive in its character," called "competitive tariff." What is the name they are now giving it? First, tariff for revenue; second, tariff with incidental protection; third, competitive tariff. What will be the name now to be applied? It is all an effort to get away from the name—free trade. To-day we find them defending the protective idea that covers some specific articles of their own localities, but rejecting other articles not in their territory.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator's account of the great calamities which have followed tariff legislation is to some degree accurate. I want to call his attention to the fact that since the enactment of the last perfect tariff bill we have now more than a million farmers who have lost their homes in the United States, and the calamity is greater than all the calamities added together which he has described.

Mr. FESS. Back in 1896 that kind of talk was stigmatized as calamity howling. All over the country we had just that sort of talk. We have not heard much of it until recently it broke out in the Senate. It was voluble yesterday. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] undertook to show that in the missions in this city there are being cared for people who have no place to sleep and no food to eat, and gave it as evidence that the country is in a bad state, a bad condition. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] rose and employed as an argument to show that labor is suffering that there are a million people out of employment, and so on. Constantly the discriminations were pointed out between the well-to-do and the poor. They are offered as the results of legislation which they propose to cure here.

Let me say to my friend from Iowa that we have good authority that the poor is with us all the time. There is not a town in the broad scope of America that does not have the indigent. There is not a county in the United States that does not have an institution to take care of the infirm. There is not a city of any consequence which in every year since the war has not, as an expression of gratitude toward or sympathy for the unfortunates, gone into what we call the community chest and made contributions which in cities like

Cleveland will run up to the million mark, and in cities like my own city of Springfield, of 60,000 people, runs up to nearly hundreds of thousands, and so on. Does that mean that the Nation has been negligent and has produced by negligence the indigency which shows in every community and every city and every town?

I have visited the missions here. I want to say nothing unkind—God forbid it—and I do not mean to do it. But we can not find a town anywhere that we will not find people who suffer a lack of this world's goods because of a condition for which we are not responsible and which no legislation can cure.

We can relieve it by our voluntary efforts that show a great charitable spirit in America. These people are not out of work because they can not get the work so much as because they are not able to work or, I might say, in the cases of some of them, not willing to work. I make the statement here that there never has been a time in the history of the world, especially the last year, when there was so universal employment at such a high scale of wage, at such permanent and steady work, with so much of this world's goods generally distributed as in America at this time.

There has been a slowing down since last year. I suppose when Ford's great industry waited production in order to manufacture the new tools necessary for the new plans, with many hundreds and thousands out of employment, we are not responsible for it. I suppose when a great manufacturer sees fit to exchange the old machinery for new and must close down for a certain period in order to do it, that that unemployment is not to be laid to tariff legislation, but it is incident to the growth of the Nation's industry.

Mr. President, the arguments that we have poor in the city of Washington are not conclusive. The arguments that in my own town we have people who need help are not conclusive.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] took occasion to make an effort to prove that labor is not so well employed, and used figures which I tried to correct. The truth about the matter is that there has been a gradual decline in prices, both wholesale and retail, of the articles of industry. If that decline had been a precipitate falling off of prices, it would have been dangerous, but the decline was not precipitate. The decline has been steady, and it is in direct response to efficiency in production. We produced by the same number of people more than we produced before, and we have a greater bulk at the same cost, and that leads to a reduction of the price when it goes on the market.

It is the soundest economy that you or I can conceive to-day that when we reduce the current price in accordance with efficient service we make the cost to the consumer less and we increase the power of the consumer to buy and still lift the standard of living. So that when we speak about the lowering of the prices of these articles it does not mean that business is becoming less active. The truth about the matter is that 10 per cent less producers in 1927 produced 25 per cent more of the products. That is the soundest economy that can be offered, and instead of being looked upon as a suggestion of danger it ought to be looked upon as one of the most promising symptoms of our present day.

That leads me, Mr. President, to say another thing. We have been led by these utterances from the author of the pending resolution and others who think as he does to understand that the tariff is largely the cause of the disparity between agricultural and nonagricultural products, and it is proposed in this way to relieve that disparity. I have stated before that that is not the opinion, so far as I can get it, of agricultural thinkers who meet in Washington representing the various commissions which have been here studying the question.

On the other hand, here is a statement that can not be contradicted: Continuously there has been a gradual decrease of the purchasing dollar of nonagriculturalists up to the present day, and continuously, with a tremendous spurt last year, there has been an increase of the producing dollar of the agriculturalists. In other words, the disparity which in 1919 may have been 51 points came down last year to only about 11 points and pretty nearly disappeared by the end of the year 1927. If the lack of parity, if the disparity, is due to tariff legislation, then why, under a higher protection than before, have we a constantly decreasing price of the nonagricultural products and a constantly increasing price of the agricultural products to-day that are nearly on a parity?

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. With reference to the tariff proposition not having any relation to the present condition of agriculture, it certainly must be an economic fact that if in the United States we have four or five separate and distinct classes, if four of those classes are distinctly under a protective system and are benefited by it, and for some reason or some condition the fifth class produces under high costs, but can not obtain the protection of that system, and must sell in cheap European markets, most assuredly the tariff system has something to do with the condition of agriculture.

Mr. FESS. That is just what I was talking about.

Mr. McMASTER. And that is just what I was talking about.

Mr. FESS. Speaking about producing under higher costs leads to the question evidently that the Senator meant that the disparity is due to tariff legislation, and I state that the facts disprove that most conclusively. A disparity of 51 points at a certain date under the old law has come to be negligible in 1927.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. Under the tariff system, whether the tariff has been up or down has made some difference, that is true; but for the last 16 years, with the exception of three occasions, the farmer's dollar has been below par; and it was not during the period of high protection since 1922 that the farmer's dollar reached parity, for during the last six years, under this higher protection, the farmer's dollar has ranged all the way from 69 cents to 89 cents in value.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand charts which are graphically made to illustrate the curves of the indexes of prices. The chart covering relative purchasing power of a dollar in exchange for commodities shows that from January, 1910, to date agricultural commodities ranged slightly above nonagricultural products in the purchasing power of their respective dollars. That is a chart which I wish my friend to examine, if he does not care to take my word for it.

Chart No. 30 gives the index numbers of farm prices and wholesale prices of nonagricultural products. It shows that prices of agricultural products are slightly lower than those of nonagricultural products, but they are running close together.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, in just a moment I will yield to him.

It is true, and nobody cares to dispute it, that agricultural products have suffered in relative price in the past; there is no doubt about that; and I have thought, in view of that fact, that the Government if it could find a sound method of relief ought to apply that relief, and, Mr. President, I want now to refer to that situation and to state why I favor affording relief that is economically legitimate.

Mr. BROOKHART rose.

Mr. FESS. Does the Senator from Iowa wish to interrupt me?

Mr. BROOKHART. In reference to the charts to which the Senator has referred I wish to call attention to a matter.

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. In the first place, those charts deal with wholesale prices. But the farmer never sells wholesale or buys wholesale, either. He has to operate on a retail basis, and that makes quite a difference.

Mr. FESS. It ought to make a difference the other way, but I am sorry to say that it does not.

Mr. BROOKHART. No; it certainly does not.

Mr. FESS. On the question of giving some relief to the farmers, I desire to say that some persons hold that the problem will, under economic laws, solve itself; that Congress ought not to interfere at all; that if we let it alone it will cure itself. I have not viewed the situation in that way, and I want to state why more than that is involved.

The farmer has to pay for the things he buys a price that is largely due to management, while he gets a price for the things he sells that is subject to the law of supply and demand without being much affected or influenced by management. There is a stabilization of the prices of nonagricultural products due to the regulation of production. Such regulation has been operating for the last 10 years through the commodity committees of the leading units engaged in production with their weekly meetings or at least monthly meetings. They take an inventory; they find whether they are producing for consumption or for storage. When they find they are producing for storage, they know that they are outrunning consumption and they are going to pile up overproduction that will ultimately

cause the whole product to sell for less than a smaller output would sell for.

What a fine example is afforded by cotton. When we produced 14,000,000 bales of cotton—just enough to supply the world's market—we got a certain price, but when we produced 18,000,000 bales of cotton—4,000,000 bales more than were necessary to supply the demand of the world—we got less for those 18,000,000 bales than for the 14,000,000 bales, due to the break of the price, resulting from overproduction. That makes it necessary to regulate production if possible, and nonagricultural industry largely does regulate production. That means prices are stabilized by limiting production within the bounds of consumption. Then, too, prices are stabilized at a high level because labor, which is the chief element entering into the cost of manufactured articles, is maintained at a high level by effective organization; and not only by effective organization but by the willing support to-day of the employer, because to-day we regard it sound economically to pay a reasonably high scale of wages. No longer do we think that profit is measured only by the difference between what it costs to produce an article and the price for which it is sold, and therefore make that margin as wide as possible in order to make the profit large. That would mean few sales. We have substituted for that theory narrow margins, quick sales, and many sales; and we have entered the new economy of making small profits on individual sales, but put emphasis on a large number of sales, that large number being measured by the power of consumption. The concern in America to-day is to increase the consumptive power which is the basis of profits; and for that reason it is a sound economic principle to pay a high scale of wages. So prices are stabilized by management and wages are stabilized at a high rate by organization.

I will say to my friend from Iowa that it is difficult for us to apply the same principle to the farmer; in other words, it is quite difficult to stabilize agricultural prices by a regulation of production and it is quite difficult to stabilize them at a high level, because it is difficult for the farmers to organize. For those two reasons, especially because the price of nonagricultural articles does reflect a certain management that is not wholly due to the law of supply and demand, I would be willing to employ any legitimate plan that is sound economically to assist the farmer in lifting his prices. I offered such a plan in the last Congress.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that, in my judgment, it is perfectly easy to stabilize prices to the farmers by proper financing and control of the surplus by the control of the domestic surplus. That is what every protected manufacturer who has an exportable surplus is doing. Such manufacturers are selling abroad at less than they get at home.

I wish to state further to the Senator in reference to the index figures which he has quoted from the charts read by him that those index figures are not fair to the agricultural industry at all, because when there is a high index figure there is a short crop, and, while we have been getting a greater total return in money for short crops for a whole generation than we have for long crops—the large crops—yet we can not get enough for either one to pay the expenses and taxes of the farmer. So the index figures which the Senator has quoted are very misleading when they are used to show agricultural prosperity. A high index figure right now is due to short agricultural production.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, to me one of the strongest arguments for the maintenance of a sound protective policy is the increasing high standards of living. There has been a suggestion by one or two Senators that it is a mistake to maintain that we are on a basis of high living standards. I have examined that question from the census reports, and I have in my hand here the figures which indicate an increasing elevation of the standard of living in America.

I have not the figures for 1927, but in 1919 the index figures for savings deposits in the banks and trust companies was 144, while in 1927 the figure was 211. That does not mean a comparison of amounts but it means a comparison per capita as affecting individuals. If it related merely to the amount, the elapse of time would account for the difference, but it does not mean that. Let me say that there are more deposits in the savings banks, representing small depositors, and largely the laboring men, by seven times over than the combined capital in the national banks, the State banks, and the trust companies of the United States. There is a suggestion of the situation of labor to-day. I will add also that there are three and a half times more home owners among the laboring class than there are of home owners big and little, rich and poor in the Kingdom of Great Britain, and I include only laboring men in America.

For members of building and loan associations, representing

the builders of homes, the index figure in 1919 was 41, while in 1926 it was 85, or more than 100 per cent increase.

For sugar consumed during the year 1919, the index figure was 84, while in 1926 it was 117.

For meat consumed during the year 1919, the indicator stands at 138, while in 1926 it stood at 156.

For electrical household appliances manufactured during the year the indicator stood in 1919 at 37 and in 1926 at 55, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent.

In the case of washing machines for domestic use manufactured during the year, the index figure for 1919 stands at 39, and for 1926 it stands at 60; and so I might go on.

In the case of farms receiving electric service from central stations, in 1919 the indicator is 30; in 1926 it is 56, an increase of almost 100 per cent.

That indicates the increase of the standard of living from 1919 to 1926.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] yesterday spoke about wages. The way to find out what the average wage is would be to take the amount of money paid for labor and divide it by the number of laborers. I take those figures from the census report on manufactures. Dividing the total amount paid in wages by the number of wage earners as reported by the census of manufactures, the average annual wage for 1925 is found to be \$1,280; and that does not include merely skilled labor. That includes all kinds of labor, both sexes, all ages, all degrees of skill. The average annual wage in this country in 1925 was \$1,280. I am quite certain there is nothing like it in the history of the world. When a committee recently came over here from Europe to study labor conditions, they were amazed at the number of laborers who owned automobiles, and the number of homes that had in them modern conveniences.

Mr. President, what I am concerned about is whether we are going to yield here to a pressure that is placed upon us in the form of an alternative that "You must do what you regard as an unwise thing, or else we are going to pull down the entire fabric over our own heads." I desire, in the most earnest language I can employ, to say that the American protective tariff, designed to permit the investment of American capital in order to give employment to American labor at an American standard of wages and maintain American standards of living is the most supremely important issue that can come before the American people. If it becomes necessary for us to take this issue before the American people, there is no one fact that is more certain than that they believe in a protective tariff rather than a revenue tariff; and we shall welcome that sort of an issue if those who desire to break down this system are ready to make it.

I would suggest that this resolution be withdrawn. Let not the Senate play with a situation with which it has nothing to do, and become the subject of criticism everywhere where consistency between the two Houses is respected. Let the matter take the proper course of being introduced in the House; referred, if it is thought wise to consider it, to the committee, and then take whatever time is necessary to see whether we desire at this time to revise the tariff system.

My objection to the resolution is that every effort of this kind produces bad effects upon the American people. While I admit that as rapidly as duties become unnecessary—and that often is the case—they should be reduced, and, if we can get along without them altogether, they should be removed, I submit that this is not the time nor place to do it. In 1922, when we considered the bill that is now the law, our friends charged against it that it would destroy the revenue of the country. They wanted a tariff for revenue only, and they asserted that if we substituted a protective tariff we would destroy the revenue. It is well known that the last full year under the Underwood bill the revenue collected was \$322,000,000. This year, under the present law, the revenue is \$605,000,000. That is an increase of pretty nearly 100 per cent in the customs duties. That answers for all time the charge that protective legislation destroys the revenue.

Then we were told that this legislation would destroy our foreign commerce. It is well understood that our foreign commerce, both exports and imports, has continually increased under the present law. In the last few months there has been a little lowering of the exports of the country, but as a rule there has been a gradual increase.

So from the standpoint of revenue, from the standpoint of foreign trade, from the standpoint of employment of American labor, from the standpoint of investment of American capital, from the standpoint of general prosperity, I could not support a resolution like this even if it were pending in the House; much less when it comes up in the Senate, where it has no place.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a little while ago I attempted a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, and he said, if I quote him correctly:

The Senator from New York has a perfect right to express his views upon both sides of the question. He is on both sides. He is for protection. That will please the protectionists. He is against protection. That will please the free traders. He has a perfect right to his opinion. This is merely a gesture.

The Senator from Ohio would not permit me to reply in his time, and I am not sure that he will answer any questions that I ask him now; but I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the visit of the President to the West last year was a gesture. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the farm relief bill which he presented last year was a gesture.

The Senator says that the presentation of this matter is political bunk. That is a form of political slang which I suppose we can understand.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. I call attention to the fact that it took the Senator from Ohio a little over an hour and a half to explain that bunk.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. He spent a lot of time this morning, and I remember when he was making this gesture last year it took him a long time to put over a speech as political bunk.

The Senator says he will not quibble, yet he says if there is an excessive tariff schedule it should be reduced. He does quibble, however, when he says that we must not do anything about the tariff for two or three years, or until some other more convenient season.

The Senator says I am on both sides of this question. I deny it. In my formal address the other day I stated distinctly that I could not vote for the resolution in the form in which it was then before the Senate. Since that time the Senator from South Dakota has revised the resolution. This morning, at my suggestion, he added one word which he says he thinks is not necessary; but the resolution as it is now presented reads as follows:

Resolved, That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive schedules, establishing a closer parity between agriculture and industry, believing it will result to the general benefit of all.

I am glad to say that as modified I can vote for this resolution, and I want to say to the Senator from Ohio and to anybody who may be interested in this resolution that I am not on both sides of this question. There are excessive tariff schedules, and it is the duty of this Congress to find a way to reduce those tariff schedules.

Yesterday—I was not in the Chamber at the time—the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] became excited over this subject. I want to quote exactly what he said about the Senator from New York. He said the Senator from New York did not know anything about how tariff schedules were written.

I admit that I have not had as much to do with the writing of tariff schedules as the Senator from Connecticut. I regard the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoor] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] as great experts on writing high tariffs, and I plead guilty at once to the statement that I do not know as much about the tariff as these gentlemen do. But the particular thing that the Senator from Connecticut was disturbed about was that in my talk the day before I overstated the amount of added cost to the public involved in the aluminum schedule relating to household utensils. The Senator from Connecticut called attention to a little story I told about the aluminum pot my wife bought to make some preserves, and he said that any man who undertakes to discuss the tariff question in this Chamber ought to be sufficiently considerate of his own reputation to avoid a statement of the kind I made. I assume the Senator means that when I gave the figure of \$2.28 in the case of this particular aluminum pot it was excessive to say that that is what the tariff added to the cost. In a statement earlier in the debate he said that it would be only about half that. He said that I was about 66% per cent wrong.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not think the Senator ought to be concerned about it, however. Nobody took it seriously.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to ask the Senator this question: Does the tariff on aluminum utensils add anything to the price the American housewife must pay for them?

Mr. McLEAN. Perhaps I can answer the Senator in this way: The price of the article to which the Senator referred

was in 1919, 1920, and 1921, so far as my investigation shows, higher than the present price.

Mr. COPELAND. I am not interested in that. I ask the Senator this question: Does the tariff law of 1922, fixing a tariff of 11 cents a pound plus 55 per cent ad valorem, add anything to the price the American housewife must pay?

Mr. McLEAN. Since the Senator practically admits that he was 66% per cent wrong in his statement, I will try to answer him to the best of my ability.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator will be more than 66% per cent right when he makes his answer.

Mr. McLEAN. I think I shall be about 100 per cent right, as far as my investigation goes. I endeavored to ascertain as near as I could the price of the article to which the Senator referred—that is, a similar article produced in a foreign country—and I will say to the Senator now that he ought to know, if he is going to discuss the tariff question, that ad valorem duties are not laid upon the American valuation, but upon the foreign valuation of the article.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will remember that I said that while this utensil cost Mrs. Copeland \$4.55, we would not make that the basis, but we would take \$3.55. So that would represent the foreign value.

Mr. McLEAN. That saved the Senator from being 100 per cent wrong; it cut him down to 66% per cent. As near as I could ascertain, the foreign value of a similar article would run from 80 cents to a dollar, although we can not estimate it exactly; can only approximate it. If the Senator will add 50 per cent of a dollar—I will give him the benefit of the largest price—to 33 cents, he will find what the tariff would be, provided a person bought a foreign article.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, when that article got to the American housewife, it would cost 55 per cent of the dollar—

Mr. McLEAN. If she purchased a foreign article. Does the Senator know whether it was made in this country or not?

Mr. COPELAND. It was made in this country.

Mr. McLEAN. Then that is an entirely different question. The Senator will probably find that aluminum ware to-day is cheaper than it was in 1919, 1920, and 1921, under the Underwood tariff, three years after the war closed.

Mr. COPELAND. Just one moment. The Senator is not interested in what the Underwood tariff was. I was attempting to point out to the Senate that the tariff act of 1922 does add materially to the cost of articles purchased in this country, made in this country.

Mr. McLEAN. I did not accuse the Senator of intentionally deceiving the American people, but I do say, and I want to repeat it now, that I have had experience enough in this body to know that again and again Senators will take the floor here and make statements, similar to those made by the Senator from New York, which indicate that they have absolutely no knowledge of the subject they are discussing; and while the Senator did not intend to deceive the American people, I want to say to him that a revision of the tariff is a serious matter, and when such statements are made as the Senator made two days ago, and go out to the American people, that the tax on the aluminum vessel he cited is \$2.28, when in fact it is less than a dollar, I say that it is inexcusable on the part of the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, that is a very interesting statement and very illuminating and very cheering; but I am on my feet now to be informed by a man who is conceded to be a great tariff expert, and whether he concedes it to himself or not, he at least admits to the public that he knows more about it than I do, which would not in itself make him an expert. The Senator has already conceded that the tariff will add at least a dollar to the price of the utensil.

Mr. McLEAN. I have not conceded anything of the kind. I have said to the Senator that if the article purchased were made abroad about 90 cents would be added to the cost of the utensil.

Mr. COPELAND. By the tariff?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes. The Senator says himself that his wife purchased a domestic article.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator may speculate until sundown as to what the tariff tax was on that article, but it is my judgment, I will say to the Senator, that unless adequate rates were given to the production of aluminum articles in this country, in order that domestic competition may be maintained, his wife would pay not \$4.50 but double that amount for the articles she uses. I base that statement upon testimony that we received by the cartload when we were revising the tariff in 1922.

Let me explain that to the Senator, if he will pardon me. The Senator knows that the minute these foreign producers get into this market they accomplish what we call "pocketing" the

American producer. The New York importers are in sympathy with the foreign producers. They get these goods abroad, of course, just as cheap as they can. They bring them to this country. The price is so low that the American producer can not compete and he quits. The American people are then absolutely at the mercy of the foreign importer and we had instance after instance where those importers had received a thousand per cent more than the foreign articles cost them.

When the Senator asks me whether this article which his wife bought carries a tax or not, I say that he can speculate on that proposition, but I want to say to him that if it were not for the tariff, if we did not stimulate and protect domestic competition in that article his wife would probably pay double the price she did pay. That is the history of the matter.

Mr. COPELAND. The American housewife ought to be very much obliged to the Republican tariff makers for establishing a tariff schedule which protects them against high prices, which is the argument the Senator makes.

Mr. CARAWAY. And, if I understood the Senator, he said that some articles were a thousand per cent higher.

Mr. McLEAN. That is undoubtedly true. If the Senator heard the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday, he will realize that our foreign trade in competitive articles will grow less and less dependable as our competitors across the water avail themselves of our automatic machinery, and make everything that we make at a labor cost of from one-half to one-quarter of what the cost is in this country; and when they combine, as they probably will, and drive the American producer out of the market has the Senator any doubt that they will charge as high a price as they can get and that we shall be at the mercy of the foreign producer? We had that experience with sugar only a few years ago.

Mr. COPELAND. I have no doubt at all that the Senator is right, because they will profit by the experience of the combines in this country, which put the price up just as high as they could, and are continuing to do so; and the Aluminum Trust of America is one of the conspicuous examples.

Mr. McLEAN. The fact is that the Senator's statement is not true. The price of this very article, as far as my investigation goes, is lower than it was five or six years ago.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me ask the Senator this question: If there were not a high tariff or a tariff such as we have suggested in this paragraph, these utensils would come in from the other side, and the American housewife would buy them at a lower price, would she not?

Mr. McLEAN. I have tried to make it clear to the Senator that in all probability she would pay double the price she pays now. I do not want to repeat my statement. That is the experience we go through every time we cut the tariff—drive out the American producer and let in these foreign articles.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator should be intellectually honest. What is the use of our denying the fact that the tariff does add to the price the American consumer pays for the article? There are reasons why a tariff should be imposed in many instances, for the sake of protection to American labor. I agree to all that, and I believe, in principle, in the protective-tariff system, as the Senator knows. But the point I was trying to make the other day and am trying to make now is this, that we must admit that the tariff is violative of natural law. It prevents the free operation of the law of supply and demand, and necessarily out of it comes an increase in price. I was making this point not to make an attack upon the system but to justify the position taken by these gentlemen who believe in some form of farm relief, that if the great manufacturers of America are to have protection which they get through the tariff system, and if the labor unions are to do and continue what I think is a very wise thing, to deal collectively with the employers and fix the price of labor, we must face the fact that the farmer, who is left in the open field of competition, is not fairly dealt with.

Mr. McLEAN. That inspires me to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator think that reducing the tariff to a point below the difference in cost of production at home and abroad; that is, to an extent that will necessitate the cutting of wages in this country, would help the farmer?

Mr. COPELAND. No; I do not.

Mr. McLEAN. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. COPELAND. And I am consistent in that position, as the Senator must know.

Mr. McLEAN. I am delighted to hear the Senator say that; and, that being his position, it would seem to me that he would hesitate about voting for the pending resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment. I do not want to have the Senator get any false idea from what I have said. I believe that the tariff on aluminum utensils is excessive, and I believe that the tariff upon aluminum is excessive. If the Senator

yesterday heard the speech made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] he, too, must be convinced; certainly he did not rise to his feet to question the conclusions of the Senator from Montana, though the Senator challenged the Senate to bring on any question or to raise any issue regarding the conclusions reached by him in his address.

Mr. SMOOT. What were his conclusions?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Montana said, as found on page 1375 of the RECORD:

I wonder if there is any conception among the Members of the Senate as to just exactly what that increase in price of 3 cents per pound on aluminum meant to American consumers.

He was speaking about the ingots and pigs, and not of the utensils, which we were discussing a moment ago.

Since that time the consumption of aluminum has increased very largely. Every manufacturer of household utensils, and particularly every manufacturer of automobile bodies, was called upon to pay 3 cents a pound more for his aluminum on account of this duty as here disclosed.

I have caused a computation to be made—

The Senator from Montana continued—

and I find that since that time that increase has cost the American people, assuming the increase to be 3 cents per pound, not less than \$800,000, and the duty upon sheets and coils unquestionably was at least a million dollars. All this goes to the Aluminum Co. of America, the only producer of crude aluminum in this country. Every dollar of it goes to that company, a gift to the company.

That company is also engaged, or at least one of its subsidiaries, the Aluminum Manufactures Co., in the production of household utensils manufactured from aluminum, upon which, as we were told by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER], there is a duty of 11 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem.

The Senator from Montana said that with that duty, which the Senator from Connecticut and I have been discussing, of 11 cents per pound, plus 55 per cent ad valorem—

I have no doubt at all that it realized from that source as much as it did from the other two sources combined. So that this has amounted to a gift to the Aluminum Co. of America, of which Andrew W. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, is the controlling figure, of not less than \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana made his statement. I do not know that his statement is incorrect. I have not read it. The Senator from Montana is a very able man; he is now known as the great American investigator; in fact, his friends have suggested that he might well be elected President of the United States upon the splendid record that he has made in this regard. I am somewhat surprised, however, that the Senator from Montana has not gone to the Tariff Commission with this problem. They have the power to recommend a reduction of 50 per cent, and he could no doubt get it through that source.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me inquire if there is not something pending before us in the way of an investigation, not made by the investigating Senator from Montana but by the Attorney General relative to the Aluminum Co. of America?

Mr. McLEAN. He could not reduce the tariff. The Tariff Commission, if they recommend a reduction to the President, might bring about a reduction of that tariff.

Mr. COPELAND. That is to be regretted.

Mr. McLEAN. It seems to me, if I were the Senator from Montana I would try that plan before I urged complete revision of the tariff.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator from Connecticut doubt that the imposition of this tariff has enriched the Aluminum Co. of America to a very considerable extent?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know. They employ between 20,000 and 30,000 men and pay high wages. It is possible that they have made some money, and it is fortunate if they have. We have to raise between \$3,000,000,000 and \$4,000,000,000 in taxes, and I think it is a good thing that somebody in this country is prosperous.

Mr. COPELAND. Was the Senator from Connecticut here yesterday when the Senator from Montana made his speech?

Mr. McLEAN. I was not.

Mr. COPELAND. I see the Senator from Utah is on his feet. Was he here yesterday?

Mr. SMOOT. No. I just told the Senator I was not here.

Mr. COPELAND. All right. I want to read into the RECORD what the Senator from Montana said:

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator upon this floor to stand here and attempt to make a justification of these rates. They are nothing more than a pure gift to the Aluminum Co. of America of anywhere

from three to five million dollars a year. Senators will bear in mind also that that company is the sole producer of aluminum in America—a perfectly iron-bound copper-riveted monopoly.

That is what he said yesterday.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator knows that aluminum is not a finished product. It is made from what we call bauxite, I believe.

Mr. COPELAND. I am aware of that.

Mr. McLEAN. My recollection is that several Senators on the other side of the Chamber voted for a tariff on bauxite. I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] did, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. COPELAND. May I say to the Senator from Connecticut that it does not make any difference to me how many Senators on this side of the aisle voted that way. I am trying to make clear to the country, if I can, that the protective tariff system, certainly the excessive schedules, has increased the prices of goods consumed by the people of America and that by reason of those increased prices they are contributing to the prosperity of the manufacturers of America. I have no fault to find with that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERWER in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The interest that I have in imposing a tariff upon aluminum and aluminum ware is to keep the industry in the United States. I want to tell the Senator from New York that the Aluminum Co. of America owns, I suppose, 60 or 75 per cent of the raw material of the world.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not doubt it.

Mr. SMOOT. If the United States wants to drive that company out and let those 20,000 employees find some other work, employees who are paid wages as high as, if not higher than, wages in any other industry in the country, that company can establish their business in a foreign country where they get its bauxite, the raw material, and ship the finished material in here free. If the industry was destroyed in the United States and they had the complete market at their control, because they virtually control the raw product of the world, we then would find what the housewife in the United States would have to pay for aluminum ware, and besides that we would not get any revenue from that industry at all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a question in that connection?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am told that the Aluminum Co. of America has one of the biggest plants in the world on the Saguenay River in Canada, and if this tariff duty were wholly taken off it would be able to supply the needs of the United States from that plant and import the aluminum in pig or in roll form into the United States free of duty.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, too, that I know it to be a fact that they have one of the greatest water powers in the world at that point, and so far as dollars and cents are concerned the Aluminum Co. of America could go to Canada now and establish their plant at that water power, right at the water's edge. They could establish their industry there and could make aluminum there cheaper than anywhere else in the world. They own properties all over the world, and raw materials are shipped in here.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, are the raw materials of aluminum shipped in here?

Mr. SMOOT. A great deal of it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, now, Mr. President!

Mr. SMOOT. I know a great deal of it is.

Mr. CARAWAY. Just a minute, if I may interrupt the Senator without getting all excited about it. More than 90 per cent of the aluminum used in this country is mined in my own State of Arkansas.

Mr. SMOOT. I know a great deal is mined in the Senator's State.

Mr. CARAWAY. Bauxite is the raw material.

Mr. SMOOT. They own mines, as I said, all over the world and they could get all the bauxite they want without using a single solitary ton of bauxite from the United States.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why would it be cheaper to ship it to Canada than to manufacture it in this country?

Mr. SMOOT. The water rates do not amount to as much as the railroad rates.

Mr. CARAWAY. But it can not ship by water because it is mined inland.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does not the Senator know that the richest mines of bauxite in the world are in British and

Dutch Guiana, right at the seacoast, and that the bauxite can be taken and is being taken from there right to the Saguenay plant without ever touching a railroad?

Mr. SMOOT. And unloaded right at the plant.

Mr. CARAWAY. Taken to the Great Lakes borders and unloaded?

Mr. SMOOT. No; unloaded on the Saguenay River in Canada.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Saguenay River flows into the St. Lawrence below Quebec.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have heard of it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is where they would establish the industry.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator from Utah contemplate that the lowering of the schedule on aluminum and household utensils made of aluminum, so that it could not be called an excessive schedule, would drive this great company out of America?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think so. I do not think it would as long as there was sufficient tariff to equalize the difference.

Mr. COPELAND. That is to say, the tariff could be lowered and the company would still continue to make some money?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say so, and I do not know. The evidence given before the committee was that this was the tariff rate that would hold the industry in the United States, and I know, as I stated, that if the tariff is reduced so that they could produce the goods plus the tariff more cheaply in Canada or at any other place that is where they would go.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to say to the Senator that, of course, I tremble to think what might happen to the housewives of the country and the farmers and the country itself if we did not maintain this excessive tariff on aluminum. I can see from what the Senator says that the foundations of the Republic would be undermined if we were to do it. However, I want to call his attention to a letter which I placed in the Record on January 11, at page 1316, from an independent manufacturer of aluminum in America. He said:

I repeat again that the many independent foundries making parts of automobiles, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and other household appliances; also the many makers of kitchen utensils would be distinctly benefited by a lower cost on this raw material.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; raw material.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; raw material.

Mr. COPELAND. That is all right; but the Senator was finding fault a moment ago with the statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], wherein he spoke of the advantage accruing to the Aluminum Co. of America by this increase of 3 cents per pound, which had amounted to not less than \$1,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah did not find any fault. The Senator stated that with the situation existing in this country it would be very easy to drive this industry out of the United States. The way to do it is to reduce the tariff so low that it would be profitable for that industry to move to Canada and to make its product there.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; but the Senator at the same time—

Mr. SMOOT. As to the letter which was read here, the writer buys the raw material, but he does not say anything about the duty on the finished product. He wants free raw material and then he wants just as high protection as possible upon the manufactured goods. That is inconsistent.

Mr. COPELAND. And the Senator from Utah would be opposed to that?

Mr. SMOOT. I am opposed to any duty which is not required and in which there would not be some advantage to the United States. I am not opposed to taking care of the Senator's correspondent. I think he is taken care of, but he wants still more. One of the complaints which the Senator from Montana made yesterday was as to the manufactured product. The gentleman who wrote the letter is not trying to sell his product for less than the American Aluminum Co. sells its product.

Mr. COPELAND. No; he does not do it, because he gets the benefit of the tariff and he takes advantage of it.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; in other words, if he did not have a tariff he would not be in business, and he knows it just as well as does the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah is right in that sense, but the Senator from Utah has conceded—he did so a few moments ago—that the tariff on aluminum might be very materially reduced and still not drive the manufacturer out of business.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from New York suggested that that was the case, and the Senator from Utah did not have an opportunity to answer the suggestion. I will answer it now by saying I do not know whether or not the reduction of

this tariff at the present time and under present conditions would drive the industry out of the United States. I do, however, know that when the subject was under discussion that that was the representation made to the committee, and that the committee believed it, and so did Congress believe it.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Utah knows very well, however, if the Senator from Montana is correct in stating that the profits of the Aluminum Co. of America are \$5,000,000, that lowering the tariff is not going to drive the Aluminum Co. of America from our country.

Mr. SMOOT. If that company could make twice that profit in a foreign country, that is just exactly what they would do. They would go right over into Canada and make the product there; and I know that they are prepared to do it, I will say to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I am ready to believe that the Aluminum Co. of America is prepared to do anything that will benefit the Aluminum Co. of America, but I have not found any evidence anywhere to show that they are seeking to benefit the housewives of America.

I think that out of this discussion has once more been developed the fact—I say “once more” because every time the tariff is discussed the same fact is developed—that the protective-tariff system does increase the price of goods which are consumed by the people of this country. Every time a farmer buys a utensil or an implement, outside of the large farming implements, so called, when he buys a knife or a saw or a chain or a pick axe or a crowbar or a nail or a hammer he is paying an increased price because of the protective-tariff system. If that be true, and if the farmer is contributing to the welfare of the industrial plants of this country, contributing to the welfare of the manufacturers, why does not the industrial world in its turn say to the oppressed farmer, the farmer who is not prosperous, “If there is anything we can do to help you to obtain your share in this protection, we are going to do it”? But that is not the attitude.

I think that on two occasions I was the only Senator east of Indiana to vote for the McNary-Haugen bill. I voted for it twice. On both occasions I said, “The bill is violative of economic law; it interferes with the free flow of goods, and, therefore, it does unquestionably interfere with the law of supply and demand; it is uneconomic; but so is the tariff system, so is the labor-union collective bargaining, and the fixing of wages, which I am glad is being done; so is the fixing of rates on the railroads, permitting railroads to make a certain profit.” All those things, Mr. President, are violative of economic law.

As I view it, in this country we must choose between an attack upon the tariff system and its destruction, an attack upon the labor unions and the destruction of those organizations, an attack upon railroad rates and the structure of railroad rates and their destruction. We have to choose between giving protection to every class in this country or we will have to submit to the destruction of these things which every one of us will admit are for the good of the country.

There is not a Senator on the other side of the aisle who is more convinced of the wisdom, the importance, and the necessity of the protective-tariff system than am I.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the present tariff act the rates which were asked for by the farm organizations of this country were inserted.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, why does the Senator give us another bit of talk like that? If I were the Senator from Ohio, I would say that that was “political bunk.”

Mr. SMOOT. It may be “political bunk,” but the Senator is discussing the question of the tariff, as I understand him. Now he brings in the farmer, and from what he has said he seems to think the farmer has not been treated the same as have those who are engaged in other industries. I wish again to say to the Senator that the farmer received exactly what he asked for in the present tariff act.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator knows full well that the thing for which the farmer asked does not do him any good.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah does not know any such thing. I know that it does do him good; and I can tell the Senator without a moment's hesitation how it does him good.

Mr. COPELAND. I thought, perhaps, the Senator was going to do that.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to take the Senator's time to do it, but I could start—

Mr. COPELAND. I have more than an hour before I will be compelled to leave the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. I could start with various agricultural commodities and go through them. Does the Senator think, for instance, that the tariff on wool has not done the farmer any good?

Mr. COPELAND. I think the tariff on wool has done him good.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator think the tariff on sugar has not done him good?

Mr. COPELAND. I think it has done the Senator's State good and the few States which raise sugar beets.

Mr. SMOOT. The State of the Senator from Utah is not the only one that produces sugar beets by any manner of means.

Mr. COPELAND. The farmers have been benefited so far as that particular item is concerned; but, as I said the other day, we could afford to go into our pockets and pay a bounty to the beet-sugar growers of this country in order that the housewives might be saved \$250,000,000 a year by reason of the increased prices which they are compelled to pay because of the tariff duties on sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from New York has never told the Senate how he would raise that \$250,000,000 revenue for the Government or from what source he would have it come. It would have to be raised in some manner somewhere, because it goes to pay the expenses of the Government. I could go through the list of commodities which the farmer produces and show that the tariff duties have benefited the farmer. If there are any rates in the law which are not sufficient, so far as I am personally concerned, I will be very glad to see them increased.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, when wheat sells higher in Canada than it does in the United States, how does the tariff on wheat profit the farmer?

Mr. SMOOT. All I can say is that the reports of the Department of Commerce show that not to be the case.

Mr. CARAWAY. That it is not the case?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is not the case when the prices of the same grades of wheat are compared.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, well—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may laugh, but that is what the Department of Commerce states. I had the figures here the other day.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know the Senator did and everybody else had figures here to show the opposite.

Mr. SMOOT. No; everybody else did not have such figures.

Mr. CARAWAY. Just a moment. The Senator has gotten in the habit of disputing everybody's word, so that he does not wait to find out what they are going to deny, but just hollers out “no” almost every time a statement is made. If he would wait a little while, somebody might agree with him at some time. I do not think anybody will, but that might happen, although if it should the one agreeing would be wrong.

But I started to say that the market quotations were put in the RECORD by the Senator from Iowa where actual wheat was being sold, and they showed a discrimination in favor of Canada of nearly 20 cents a bushel. Of course, the Senator from Utah can say that is not so.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not said anything about that statement. The figures may have related to different grades of wheat. All I say is that the same grade of wheat is not selling for a higher price in Canada than it is in the United States.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; I heard the Senator say that.

Mr. SMOOT. And I say that I can prove it by our Department of Commerce.

Mr. CARAWAY. One may prove anything by the Department of Commerce. If what the Senator from Utah has just said can be proven in that way, then, anything can be proven in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be proved, for it is an absolute fact.

Mr. CARAWAY. Can the Senator say that of his own knowledge?

Mr. SMOOT. From the way in which we obtain knowledge, I can say it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Knowledge is obtained, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. And that is the way all knowledge is obtained.

Mr. CARAWAY. I can not receive a statement like that with any seriousness at all. Now, if the Senator from New York will pardon me for a moment.

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] took us all to task yesterday for our utter lack of knowledge or accuracy, and then made this most wonderful statement. I desire while he is present to refer to it. He said:

The American people are just absolutely at the mercy of the foreign importer, and we had instance after instance where these importers had received a thousand per cent more than the article cost them.

About the highest rate of duty at all, as I understand, is 100 per cent; and how could even the Senator from Connecticut explain in what manner a hundred per cent duty could keep

out an article on which there was a thousand per cent profit? I ask the question in the interest of accuracy, because that statement comes from the side where accuracy has its habitat. Yet we are asked to take that kind of statement seriously.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, let me say—

Mr. McLEAN. I presume the Senator thinks I ought to have an opportunity to reply?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course; but I heard the Senator take a week at it.

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Arkansas says that I took a week at it. This indicates that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas himself can make statements that are far from correct.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is as correct, however, as saying that an article on which there is a thousand per cent profit can be kept out by a hundred per cent duty. The Senator, of course, did not take a week; it merely sounded that long to those who were listening to him.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Connecticut said that it appeared to the committee when we were revising the tariff that in some instances the American producer had been "pocketed," as they call it; that is, importers had brought articles from abroad until they had driven the American producer out of market or had destroyed his market.

Mr. CARAWAY. But we could not protect the American producer against an article on which there was a thousand per cent profit by imposing a duty of 100 per cent, could we? What would be the use of putting a duty on such an article unless the duty were placed at a thousand per cent?

Mr. McLEAN. The rate fixed was of no use in some instances.

Mr. CARAWAY. What was the use of making a gesture and giving a man 100 per cent protection against an article sold at 1,000 per cent profit?

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator fails to understand the situation.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know I do not understand it, and I never will be able to understand it.

Mr. McLEAN. This situation arises; When the American producer of these articles is in what they call a "pocket," he has no market; would-be purchasers do not buy of him, but they buy of the importer, and when they buy of the importer and there is no domestic competition the retailer is then in a position to charge about anything he pleases. That appeared in evidence, and the evidence was not contradicted. The Senator will remember that the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] mentioned item after item here of which the retail price was ten times the price which the importer paid for the foreign article. That is what I said.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator meant to imply, if he meant anything, that the tariff was the thing that was preventing the American manufacturer from running against a 1,000 per cent profit, and he made that statement when he was lecturing the Senator from New York and aspersing all of us on our side for inaccuracy; and it was such a striking example of accuracy that I merely wanted to call attention to it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I may resume—I thank both Senators for assisting in the debate—the Senator from Utah mentioned wheat.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not mention it.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator spoke about the tariff on wheat.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I replied to the question that wheat was less in this country than in Canada.

Mr. COPELAND. Anyhow, wheat has been mentioned, and that leads me to say a thing or two about it.

One reason why I am personally so interested in some form of relief for the farmer is because of the wheat situation. There is a lot of talk up in the Northwest about the St. Lawrence Canal, and how a canal from the Great Lakes to the sea somehow or other is going to help the wheat farmer of the West or Northwest. Of course, I am opposed to that canal. I believe that if we are to build such a canal we should build it across New York State to the headwaters of the Hudson River; and in attempting to develop the reasons for that conviction I made a study of the wheat situation.

I wonder how many of us have looked into that situation. Last year we exported about 100,000,000 bushels. Canada exported 250,000,000 bushels. Why is it that Canada can take care of its surplus wheat and we can not? It is that surplus that is giving the farmer the trouble.

The reason why the Canadian wheat goes to the Liverpool market is because it can go to the Liverpool market at a

price far below the possibility of raising and selling American wheat. The absurdity of the St. Lawrence Canal project is shown by the fact that it would only facilitate the removal more cheaply of more Canadian wheat. You can take wheat in Canada from Saskatchewan and Alberta to the lake head at Port Arthur for 28 cents a bushel. To take wheat from Montana to Duluth at the lake head costs 44 cents a bushel. There is a difference of 16 cents a bushel in freight alone between American-raised wheat in the American Northwest and Canadian-raised wheat in the Canadian west.

We never can compete with that situation. We must face the fact that somehow or other we must either eat our own surplus or find some other way of disposing of it. That means this, as I see it: There must be found some way to equalize the American cost of producing wheat and marketing it or disposing of it and the price of the foreign article, just exactly as there is the necessity of equalizing the price between American production and foreign production. In other words, if the farmer is to have any degree of prosperity in the future he must have some form of farm protection.

The whole purpose of everything I have said to-day or any other day in connection with the pending resolution is to emphasize the fact that the protective-tariff system does increase the price to the American consumer and that the farmer is a large contributor to that increased price. The American farmer is affected by the labor-union situation, which I approve, as I have said repeatedly. If we are to permit the protective-tariff system to remain intact, and to permit labor to continue its collective bargaining, we must give equal protection to the farmer; and the logic is irresistible, so far as I can see.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator mentioned the relation of labor and the labor union to this matter. Apparently the Senator agrees with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that that increases the farmers' costs very greatly.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the total gross production of manufacturers in the United States is about \$60,000,000,000, and of that labor gets only about \$11,000,000,000; so the benefits to labor in this situation are not much greater than the benefits to the farmer.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. I thank the Senator for what he has said. We can not question at all the relationship of the labor union and the fixing of price for their work to costs on the farm.

I own and operate a farm about 25 miles from New York, and labor upon my farm is influenced very greatly by the price of labor in the city. I have to pay an increased price for labor upon my farm because of the high price of labor in the city. That is a matter of no particular concern to me because my kind of a farm would never make a living for anybody, anyhow; but when the farmer is dependent upon his crop, and particularly where he is a one-crop farmer, there must be found for him some permanent and sure means of relief. Therefore I would apply exactly the same method of protection to the solution of the farmer's problem that we applied to the solution of the manufacturer's problem, and the same measure of relief that the labor union got when it started to deal collectively.

That is where I stand. The Senator from Ohio is most unjust when he intimated that I was trying to carry water on both shoulders. I am not, I believe in a protective-tariff system, but if there is an excessive schedule I want it reduced. It is only right that it should be reduced. I do stand here to say, however—and if I were the only Senator in this body to say it I would still say—that the farmer is entitled to the same measure of relief that we have given through the protective-tariff system to the manufacturer. It is the duty of the Senate, as I see it, to endeavor to find some means of solving this great economic problem and giving relief to our basic industry.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday pointed out the fact that there has been a very large increase in the exportation of wheat to foreign ports from Canada. He indicated that if the present tendency continued, Canada would shortly obtain a large percentage of the wheat export business which the United States heretofore has enjoyed. The suggestion of the Senator from Idaho led me to consult some statistics, and I have been surprised at the information revealed. The extent of the decline in the exportation of wheat from the United

States has been most marked. The increase in the exportation of wheat from Canada has been amazing.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to these figures not only because they confirm the fears expressed by the Senator from Idaho but they also open up another subject for consideration.

The entire shipments of wheat from the port of Montreal in 1920 were 44,121,000 bushels. In 1921 the shipments were 50,112,000 bushels. In 1926 the shipments were 90,000,000 bushels—a gain of more than 100 per cent in six years.

Now, let us consider what were the exports of wheat from all the ports of the United States. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, there were exported 156,250,000 bushels of wheat, as compared with 293,268,000 bushels in 1921 and 208,321,000 bushels in 1922—a decline of almost 100 per cent in the exportation of wheat from the United States.

These figures show the inroads which Canada is making into the wheat-export business of the United States, and they also show what is of equally great importance—that the Canadian Government policy of supporting and maintaining a merchant marine of its own has been of tremendous assistance in increasing the export business of Montreal and other Canadian ports.

Canada has a merchant-marine policy. We have none. Canada has given preferential freight rates to farm products. We have not. Canada has, through its own transportation systems, what is called a national interest in developing export business. We have none.

These figures might well cause alarm to the wheat-growing sections of America. But I present them not so much to emphasize the need of attention to and study of the agricultural problem which has been called to our attention by the zealous Senators from the Western States as to refer to the importance and need now of an American merchant-marine policy—definite, unmistakable, and comprehensive.

To indicate to what an extent the nearest port in the United States to the Montreal port has lost business as a result of the advantages which the Montreal port enjoys by reason of favorable freight rates of the Government-owned railroads and because of the Government's keen, anxious, and willing support of shipping facilities, I ask you to study a comparison of the figures of grain exports from the port of Boston and of wheat exports from the port of Montreal.

The exports of grain from Boston to foreign ports in 10-year periods from 1906 were:

Year ending Dec. 31:	Bushels
1906	18,204,757
1916	33,274,441
1926	3,492,721

The exports of wheat from Boston in 1916 were 3,775,000 bushels and in 1926 were 225,000 bushels.

In Montreal the amount of wheat exported has increased in 10 years from approximately 14,298,000 in 1916 to 90,000,000 bushels in 1926. In five years the port of Montreal has increased its export of wheat 100 per cent, while its nearest American port has decreased its export of grain (including all wheat) from 33,000,000 bushels to 3,000,000 bushels.

The intention of Canada to further reduce traffic through our ports is well indicated by the recent request of the Canadian Railroad Commission that the rates from Buffalo to St. John and Halifax be made the same as the rate from Buffalo to New York, disregarding the fact that the haul from Buffalo to Halifax is twice as long as the haul from Buffalo to New York.

In 1923 the number of bushels of grain exported from the following ports were:

Year ending Dec. 31:	Bushels
Montreal	120,013,038
New York	87,130,000
Baltimore	41,083,000
Philadelphia	32,107,000
Boston	9,387,662

The development of the port of Montreal and other Canadian ports reflects the policy of the Canadian Government. A continuation of this policy can only be counterbalanced by placing our ports in a favorable position with regard to rail and ocean port differentials for the sake of "national interest."

Mr. President, I call attention to these figures to ask the Senate to give some thought to the importance of a definite merchant-marine policy before the same story will be repeated in regard to the exports of other products than wheat.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment for a question?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the first address I made in the Senate was in behalf of a merchant marine. I believe in it with all my heart. I would like to see legislation to bring it about. I wanted to ask the Senator what form of merchant marine he

would approve—a subsidy sufficient to equalize the difference in the expense of maintaining a merchant marine by American labor as against a foreign country, or some specific amount issued to any party or parties who may become interested in maintaining a line of ships between this country and other countries?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am pleased to answer the question of the Senator from Utah. Under present conditions, as the situation now exists in this country, I am in favor of a Government-owned and a Government-operated merchant marine. I see no other solution of the question. I have reached that conclusion somewhat reluctantly, for I want frankly to say that I would much prefer a privately owned American merchant marine than a Government-owned merchant marine. I am fully aware of the abuses, the difficulties, and the waste resulting from Government operation. But there is no other choice. I am opposed to subsidies of any kind or character. I do not believe the shipping interests of this country have any more right to a subsidy to maintain shipping upon the high seas than the railroads, or the manufacturing, and the agricultural interests have a right to a subsidy. I consider the giving of subsidies one of the most dangerous evils that can creep into any governmental system.

Mr. President, I would try to carry out the intent and purpose of the shipping laws that are now upon the statute books providing for an American merchant marine. I consider that the shipping act of 1920 now in operation provides the support for an adequate American merchant marine first and last. The intent of Congress was not to abandon the advantage that we had at the end of the war from having a merchant marine costing billions of dollars that brought the flag of the American Republic into every port in the world. When the act was passed, it was never intended, it was never expected, that we would recede from the progress we made during the years of the war. The fault is not with the absence of law, it is with the policy and manner in which the law has been administered.

To be sure, it was provided in that act that we should seek and keep before us the purpose to convert our Government-owned merchant marine into the hands of private individuals, when such interests could develop and maintain a merchant marine; but it was never intended to declare our triumphant and superb American merchant marine that we inherited from the war bankrupt. It was never intended that at the end of the World War after building up an American merchant marine it should be liquidated, should be destroyed, as it practically has been by the policy that has since been pursued. As I understand that policy, it has been to get these ships into the hands of private owners at any sacrifice, under any circumstances, to discourage Government operation, and to get the American Government out of maintaining an American merchant marine. The trouble we are now experiencing—and I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on this proposition—is due to the fact that the present law has not been given sympathetic execution by those in charge of the merchant marine policy of our country.

I think I have answered the Senator's question by stating that under present circumstances, with Government-owned ships in our possession, with the great need and importance of maintaining a merchant marine as an auxiliary to our Navy, I am in favor of a vigorous, positive, enthusiastic development of our merchant marine, and of abandoning the policy that has been pursued in recent years of destroying it, or taking the very lifeblood out of it by delaying, postponing, and discrediting the opportunity to give a real trial of Government operation.

Mr. President, as a matter of defense, regardless of our commercial necessities, I am heart and mind for a Government merchant marine—not one that would compete with the limited private American shipping interests now on the seas but as an auxiliary to them.

I arose, Mr. President, for the purpose of calling attention to the problem of the export of wheat, and to point out that it involves not only the great agricultural problem of the West, but it involves the question of whether Canadian ports and the Canadian merchant marine are eventually to transport all the wheat and much of the other export business of the country. Canada has already made tremendous advances, as I have pointed out. I do not hesitate to say that, linked with this agricultural question, is the importance of providing facilities for transporting at reasonable rates, speedily and regularly, to the ports of the world this most important export product of the American people.

I hope that attention will be given before many weeks have passed to the legislation pending here seeking to resuscitate, to put life, to put vitality into our merchant marine, and to establish a definite policy which will declare us either in the

business or out of the business of shipping. So far as I am concerned, while 67 per cent of our commerce is carried in foreign bottoms, and until private interests are able to take care of much of this large percentage, opposed as I am to ship subsidies, I am for a Government-owned merchant marine. I urge the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] to ask for prompt action on his bill which I understand seeks this end.

THE TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have thus far taken no time upon the pending resolution, and now I shall ask the attention of the Senate for only a brief moment. If I thought that this body had any authority to act upon this question at this time I would still not be in favor of action, because I do not believe that at the present time it is wise or opportune to undertake the great subject of revision of the tariff. But I shall not go into that feature of it, because there is another reason which to me is controlling.

The Constitution of the United States is perfectly clear upon this proposition. The first paragraph of Article I, section 7, reads as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

I had the honor to serve for a brief period in the body at the other end of the Capitol. I am not unacquainted therefore, as other Senators are not unacquainted, with the attitude which that body takes upon revenue bills. They very jealously defend their rights under the Constitution. If I were a Member of the House, as I once was, I do not hesitate to say that if the Senate should adopt a perfectly inane and futile resolution of this kind and send it to the House of Representatives, I should hope that the House would not only not consider it, but would simply refuse to receive it. In my judgment, in undertaking to act upon this proposition we are absolutely beyond our authority and are doing something which, if we do it seriously, will raise in the minds of people who are thoughtful and who are acquainted with the Constitution a very grave question as to the sincerity and the information of the Senate.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. As I understand the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, no Member of the Senate or the Senate itself is to have an opinion upon any particular question until it is sanctioned by the House.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I said nothing of the kind and thought nothing of the kind. If the Senator got that impression, his facilities for obtaining impressions are bad. Of course, any individual Senator has a right to his opinion, but when it comes to the point of wasting a week or 10 days of the Senate's time in the discussion of and possibly final adoption of a resolution upon a matter which the Senator himself knows is absolutely beyond the scope of the authority of the Senate, as far as I am concerned I do not propose to participate in such action, and shall therefore vote against the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. I would like to ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio: If in his judgment he thought this resolution were perfectly proper and if in his judgment the Constitution permitted the United States Senate to initiate revenue legislation, would he vote for this resolution under those circumstances?

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has so many "ifs" in his question that I do not know whether I followed it or not. But I say to him frankly that I am opposed to this resolution, even if the Senate has authority to adopt it. Is that what the Senator wants me to say?

Mr. McMASTER. Why?

Mr. WILLIS. Because I do not believe that the present time is an opportune one for going into a revision of the tariff, and I would not vote for the resolution if it were here in legal form. That answers the Senator's question. But that is not the reason upon which I proceed.

I shall vote against the Senator's resolution, much as I dislike to do so. I should like to vote for any resolution which he sponsors, but I can not bring myself to believe that I ought to vote for a resolution which puts the Senate in a perfectly ridiculous and senseless attitude, and I am not going to do it.

Mr. McMASTER. In other words—

Mr. WILLIS. I think I have stated it very well without the Senator putting it in other words. I think I have made myself understood, so I hope the Senator will not endeavor to put it in other words.

Mr. McMASTER. I would not want to ask any embarrassing questions.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Ohio is perfectly willing to hear any question his friend wants to ask, but he is not willing to have his attitude stated in other words. I will do my own stating, and I have stated that I think the adoption of such a resolution is absolutely beyond the power of the Senate and that therefore I shall not vote to have the Senate do a futile thing and adopt a resolution which, if passed anywhere, must originate in the House in accordance with the provision of the Constitution I have just quoted.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, I would like to fortify the opinion which has just been given by the distinguished Senator from Ohio as to the absolute futility of the pending resolution, which states—

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive schedules, establishing a closer parity between agriculture and industry, believing it will result to the general benefit of all.

It is perfectly evident to every Member of the Senate that any resolution of that kind that we could pass would be of no greater value than asking the Members of the House to give a party and invite the Members of the Senate as their guests. As a revenue measure it can not originate in the Senate.

It is also futile for another reason, it seems to me, in that it is a resolution which attempts to limit the scope of the inquiry into tariff duties. I know of no attempt to revise the tariff at any time in history which has limited the question of revision to the revision downward of schedules which are excessive or has limited revision otherwise, without giving an opportunity to any industries to have inadequate tariff duties increased. Certainly many branches of agriculture to-day need a revision upward.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SACKETT. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. Just what language is there in the resolution that would not permit the changing of the agricultural schedules? What language is there in the resolution that would not permit the adjustment of almost any schedule we have in the tariff law?

Mr. SACKETT. It says the revision shall be downward.

Mr. McMASTER. And to what end, and what further purpose is expressed in the resolution? Does it not provide that revision shall be undertaken in order that agriculture may be brought nearer to a parity with industry? It is the same old interpretation put upon the resolution by every other Member in this body who opposes it. There is always some excuse, something about the language that is not just quite right to suit them. I will assure the Senator from Kentucky that if he will vote for the resolution, and if the resolution shall become effective, there will be ample opportunity to raise all the duties that he has in mind in regard to agricultural products, and I take exactly the same position. We will have also the same opportunity to reduce some excessive schedules.

Mr. SACKETT. But that is not the language of the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. If the language were changed to suit the Senator, would he vote for it?

Mr. SACKETT. Not for a resolution to raise revenue originating in the Senate, which the Senate has no right to pass and which would not be compatible with the dignity of the House.

Mr. McMASTER. Does the Senator think the United States Senate has no right to express its opinion in regard to any matter?

Mr. SACKETT. No.

Mr. McMASTER. He does not think so?

Mr. SACKETT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. McMASTER. He thinks the Senate is gagged and bound?

Mr. SACKETT. No; I said I do not think that. But when the Constitution provides the place where measures providing for the raising of revenue shall originate, then I think it is time to stop and consider the kind of resolutions we send to the House. A resolution of this kind, which in its terms places a limit upon the scope of the inquiry which the tariff revision may take, is a resolution also which I can not favor for the reason that there are many industries in my own community, both in industry and in agriculture, which decidedly need a revision upward.

I can not subscribe to the doctrines which have been enunciated on the floor of the Senate from time to time that the tariff does not afford a protection to agriculture. I think that is a

statement altogether too broad. There are many branches of agriculture to which the tariff to-day does afford protection and without which it would be in a very serious condition. I can say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the tobacco schedules to-day are a great source of revenue to the raisers of tobacco in the whole country, and without those duties the present wonderful tobacco fields of the country would be a shamble and that industry would be undoubtedly destroyed. It furnishes a good illustration, however, of the working of the tariff in agriculture, because there are some kinds of tobacco which, though protected by a duty, are export goods and, with a lack of demand in the export market, the tariff that is placed upon that kind of tobacco does not protect it.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SACKETT. I will.

Mr. McMASTER. I am under the impression that if the Senator had remained in the Chamber during these debates—

Mr. SACKETT. The Senator was here most of the time.

Mr. McMASTER. There are some statements which he has made that I hardly think he would have made had he been here all the time. I do not remember of any statement being made absolutely to the effect that protection did not aid agriculture, but I have heard the statement made that the protective duties which we have upon wheat, and possibly upon millions of dollars worth of other agricultural products, are inoperative. I have heard that statement made, but I have heard no such statement made in regard to the duties being ineffective on all products.

Mr. SACKETT. Neither have I.

Mr. McMASTER. I can not imagine what there is in the resolution that has anything to do with injury to tobacco growers in America. Can the Senator see anything in the resolution that would injure them?

Mr. SACKETT. The Senator will remember what I said. I did not say there was anything in the resolution that would injure the tobacco growers of America. I said the tariff that exists on tobacco to-day was a great benefit to the tobacco industry and without it we would not be able to raise tobacco in profusion in this country. But the instance is also there of a class of tobacco which depends for its market upon export sales, and the export market is to-day so depressed that no amount of duty placed upon that particular kind of tobacco can save that industry. That but serves to draw the distinction between those articles of agriculture which are dependent upon export, which can not be protected by any amount of duty, and those articles which depend upon the home market for their main consumption.

If there were real opportunity under the resolution or any other resolution to go into the question of a change of tariff schedules where they are shown to be excessive in industry, it would be my desire to see those schedules corrected. While a believer in the tariff as a protection to American industry and as a means of building up the market for all the products of both American industry and American agriculture, I am not such a protective advocate as to desire to see any industry unduly protected or to have the rates which protect it excessive. Under a general opportunity for a revision of the tariff any excessive rates would receive my wholesome condemnation, but under a resolution of this kind, even if it were possible to bring about a revision of the tariff by the passage of the resolution, we would not have opportunity to go into the tariff question as a whole. As I said, I know of no previous time in our history when a revision of the tariff was limited to revision downward of certain schedules that should be revised.

The tariff is becoming more and more an exceedingly important question to the section of the country which I have the honor to represent in part, not only as to my State, but the entire South. I say to my colleagues who come from that section that the matter of tinkering with the tariff may mean more disaster to that part of the country to-day than to any other section. Within the last five years industry has been seeking a location within the Southland because of the advantages that come to it through climate, through the wonderful transportation facilities, and through labor conditions. On account of the resources of power which are now available in those sections, industry has been going into every State in the South, and more and more those industries have been able to prosper during the five years last past. To-day it forms a great reservoir of opportunity to industry, and as industry grows in every State, more and more will the people become dependent upon a protection which shall permit them to operate and manufacture as against the countries of Europe with their lower wage schedules and scale of living.

For that reason I feel that any question that is raised to-day about a change of the tariff has an effect upon the business of

the South. If this were a real resolution that could have an eventual outcome of a change of the tariff schedule, we would feel throughout the country already a falling value in industry. The evenly balanced business machine of this country responds almost immediately to any suggestion that may come from the National Congress that the tariff schedules of the Nation are in danger of readjustment. Immediately we find business people beginning to haul in their horns lest they shall be crippled in the final outcome of tariff revision.

The Senate has been discussing this resolution for tariff revision now for a number of days, and no student of the markets represented in this country will for one moment think that the people of America believe there is the slightest danger of tariff revision under the resolution. It has fallen as a "dud" in the markets of the country. How different is that from the time when, at the beginning of an administration, a real tariff revision has been undertaken and business has immediately felt the discussion and felt it in every market in the land.

For that reason I can not but believe that this resolution is the outcome of a feeling of disappointment because the necessary agricultural legislation, in the opinion of those who come from the wheat States, was not enacted at the last session of Congress, a feeling of disappointment that has caused them, as was so well said this morning, to be willing to take the position that if they can not have the kind of legislation out of this Congress that would in their judgment bolster up the business of those communities, they are willing to pull the house down upon the shoulders of the people in retaliation.

Such an attitude does not gain my support even for the purpose of revising the schedules which I know are unjust and unworthy.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. SACKETT. I am about through and shall give the Senator the floor in just a moment, if he will let me.

Mr. McMASTER. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. SACKETT. Very well.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator then admits that there are excessive and unfair and unjust schedules in the present tariff act?

Mr. SACKETT. I am afraid there are.

Mr. McMASTER. That is all.

Mr. SACKETT. Yes; but I do not think, Mr. President, that when we begin talking about the unfair and unjust schedules of the present tariff act, the adjustment of which might help agriculture, it is very helpful immediately to bring up the aluminum schedule. Aluminum, of course, undoubtedly used by many agriculturists, but aluminum is a comparatively new article. We who happened to live before aluminum household utensils were available to the people of this country had the use of other household utensils, and those same household utensils can be used by agriculturists to-day without paying the tariff that is charged to the aluminum industry. That tariff may be just; it may be unjust. There is nothing before us to predicate a judgment as to that, except the fact that a company that enjoys the benefit of that tariff is prosperous. It may be the tariff is too high; if it is too high I should like to see it lowered; but the use of aluminum is not necessary to the agricultural interests of this country.

I recall that in my early days I saw household utensils made of granite ware, and I see the same character of household utensils in the stores to-day. So the use of aluminum upon the farms in any of the forms in which it is used to-day comes about by reason of one of two things—either it is cheaper than the thing for which it is a substitute, or it is so much better for the price that the users willingly pay the higher cost.

There are some schedules of the tariff which, in my judgment, ought to be revised downward, but there are some industrial schedules that ought to be raised. There is an industry in my own State and in the neighboring States for which I have been working with the Tariff Commission for more than two years, trying to get an advance in the schedules. I refer to the rag-rug industry. It seems a small one; but the warp of those rugs is made in factories and then it is sent into the mountain districts where in many households rags are pulled through the warp by the use of hand looms. It furnishes a means of livelihood to thousands of mountain families who have very little opportunity to earn money in other ways. Since 1920 a flood of rag rugs from Japan and China has deluged the domestic market. The increased importation in 1925 over 1924 was more than 2,000,000 square yards out of a total of 2,750,000 square yards altogether. The influx into this country of those rag rugs, produced by the cheap labor of the Far East, has destroyed the industry in the Kentucky mountains and the

mountains of Tennessee and of western Pennsylvania. That is an industry which is loudly calling for the help of the Government in order to maintain itself. Without an increase of the tariff sufficient to compensate for the difference between the cost of production in Japan and China and the domestic cost the people of those sections of the country must be deprived of the benefit of that industry. For that reason I say that if there is to be any revision of the tariff I can not consent for a moment to vote for a resolution which provides that only schedules that shall be revised downward shall be considered. Schedules that should be revised upward interest me fully as much on behalf of the people of my section as do the schedules that should be revised downward.

Another great industry which is being built up in that section of country and in the neighboring States is the dairy industry. That industry shows the need of further tariff protection against the importation of milk and cream and butter from across the Canadian border. It has been found that close to the great markets that industry grows faster than does any other industry of the central, southern, and northern sections of the South. It meets the direct competition of the people of Canada. That industry, too, should be given an opportunity to present its claims before I would consent to the passage of the resolution as now framed, limited to a revision downward of some few schedules that have been pointed out, and some of which, as I before stated, have little or no relation to the agricultural interests.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I yield my unstinted admiration to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] for the courage of his present adventure. I think certainly he has performed a very useful service. I have no sympathy with the arguments that are made that the Senate should not express its opinion upon any matter that is germane to that which concerns us in legislation or that which in any way concerns our people. I have no sympathy with the adjectives that have been hurled at the Senator from South Dakota because he has had the temerity to touch a subject such as the tariff. I congratulate him upon his very able presentation of this subject, and I congratulate him upon the fact that there has been a debate upon it which ought at least to be enlightening to the Senate and possibly to the country.

Mr. President, I think I understand, too, the reasons actuating the Senator from South Dakota and some of those who are aiding him in the presentation of a resolution of this kind and character. I understand, I think, better than some of our brethren here what rankles in the souls of the men in the Middle West and particularly of those who are engaged in agriculture, the very basic industry of this Nation.

I think I understand, sir, something of the catastrophe which has befallen the farming industry during the past few years, and I confess the deepest interest and an entire sympathy in anything which may be undertaken to alleviate the distress of the farmers of this land, and in anything, no matter how mistaken it may be in the opinion of some of our supposedly wise brethren, that may be undertaken by those who represent the farming communities to relieve and aid their people.

I desire, Mr. President, though, to obtain the necessary relief and to go at the matter the other way around; not by an endeavor to decrease the tariff or even indefinitely to revise it, for making a tariff law we who have dealt with the subject in the past have learned is a complex and a delicate and a difficult task. Under any circumstances it is delicate and it is difficult; under the circumstances at the present time it is more than delicate and more than difficult. So, sir, instead of touching this complex and this delicate and this difficult subject, in the endeavor to give the farmer his parity as described in the resolution in respect to the tariff, I would rather go to the specific and affirmative mode of agricultural relief, and by a definite act do him tardy justice.

I believe, sir, in anything which promises agricultural relief. I do not care that it may be determined to be bizarre by some of our distinguished economists and by many gentlemen from the East who have not the slightest conception of what is transpiring in the West. I do not care that gentlemen who arrogate to themselves all of the economic virtues or individuals who are coining their money out of eastern business say to us that what we endeavor to do for the farmer is empirical wholly and is quite beyond the pale of what they believe to be sound economics. If there is anything, any measure which promises relief, which gives even the possibility of relief to the men and the women and the children who have suffered in the Middle West, I will accept that measure, the McNary-Haugen bill or any other, in the endeavor to give something of relief to those who sorely need it.

In the endeavor to strike a parity in relation to the benefits that are derived from the tariff, the parity to which the farmer

is entitled, I would go around in that way and I would do it by specific and definitive measures presented upon that subject, and that subject alone. I do not desire to do it by going in the other direction and undertaking the task, which ever is delicate and which in this instance is more than difficult, of revising, altering, or amending the present tariff law.

To revise downward excessive rates is something that I can scarcely wholly comprehend. I recognize that there are excessive rates; I recognize undoubtedly there are rates that ought to be reduced in a tariff law; but, coming from the West, coming from a territory that has asked tariffs and has received tariffs upon those things that come from the soil, I am not ready at this period and at this session to rest upon the determination of any of our eastern brethren as to what may be excessive rates in a tariff bill. What may seem to be excessive rates in a tariff upon the industrial products of the East to me would seem to those of the East quite the reverse; while what might seem to be excessive rates on the products of the soil of the Pacific coast to those who live in Massachusetts would seem to me to be, indeed, less than ought to be accorded.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. As I understand the distinguished Senator from California, he would not favor a reopening of the tariff law, owing to the fact that he would not trust the interests of California to eastern interests and to their ideas in regard to tariff rates upon agricultural products raised in California. Then, as I understand, according to that theory, we must never again bring up the question of tariff revision?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; not at all, sir. Indicating an opinion here and asking the House to revise rates downward is a very different proposition from taking up a tariff bill in the regular course of legislation in the Congress of the United States. I do not wish to put it quite as harshly as the Senator did, that I would not trust our eastern brethren as to rates which should be accorded to the fruits, the nuts, and other products of the soil of the Pacific coast; but, sir, I would prefer, if there were to be any revision concerning the rates on those products which are grown upon the Pacific coast, myself to be a part of that revision, and to be a part of the determination whether or not any rate was excessive.

Sir, I violate no confidence, and say what is really a matter of history when I recite how the rates were obtained for the territory of the Senator from Oregon and the territory that I represent on the Pacific coast when the tariff bill was under discussion in 1922. We formed a bloc then. Rail at blocs, as you see fit, sir; say what you will regarding any organization within the organization of the Senate; but when the tariff bill was under discussion we formed what was termed a western bloc; and we formed it for protection of our States and our products. It embraced about 25 Senators from the West; and those 25 Senators appointed an executive committee of five, of which I had the honor to be one; and that bloc said to the gentlemen from the East, who were concerned alone in an industrial tariff, "All right, gentlemen; the West, with its 25 votes in the United States Senate, is finally going to have a tariff that suits the West"; and the West got a tariff that suited the West upon the products of the soil.

Blocs, of course, in mock horror, our eastern brethren say, are terrible things; dangerous, too; but, nevertheless, the organization of the West in 1922 effected the result at that time of giving to the West a modicum of that which had always been taken by the East; and I am very glad that we organized, and very glad that the result was attained.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. I want to congratulate the Senator upon the work of the bloc during that session. I think they did obtain most substantial results; but did they obtain everything that the farmers asked for? Not by a long way. The testimony before the Finance Committee shows that the farmers asked for higher duties on many things, and those duties were cut. Notwithstanding that, I agree with the distinguished Senator from California that that bloc did put up a most magnificent fight, and they got so much more than they had ever gotten before that it was really a victory.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right; and I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that when the tariff bill comes here again, if I happen to be a Member of the Senate at that time and the Senator from South Dakota happens to be a Member, I hope we will form again a western bloc; and we will not only get what we got before but we will get all of the things that the Senator from South Dakota would like to get to-day. I will aid him in then getting them to the best of my ability.

I recall, sir, the tariff that we then obtained. It is a singular thing that our tariffs in the West, generally speaking, are very

different from the tariffs in the East. Our tariffs relate to those things that come up out of the soil. They are very valuable to us, just as the tariffs that the Senator from South Dakota would have for his territory are very valuable to him. Ours are walnuts and almonds and olives and olive oil, lemons, and other products—things that come up out of the soil, and that under certain circumstances come into the fiercest kind of competition with things that are grown abroad.

I remember when the first question and the first contest came upon lemons here. The late lamented Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, Mr. Penrose, was then chairman of the Finance Committee. Upon this floor the State that I represent in part was represented then by one gentleman of the Democratic Party and one whose party is Republican. After a contest by the Republican Senator from California, who now speaks, for an increased tariff on lemons, the Senator from Pennsylvania accorded it in the emergency tariff bill; and for the first time in the history of the State of California we had a tariff upon lemons approaching justice. The rate was subsequently carried into the general tariff bill.

I recall subsequently the tariff that we sought upon almonds. Do you realize, sir, where the opposition came from? Every great confectioner in the East came down to Washington. Some of our distinguished brethren from New Jersey, I recall particularly, and from some of the New England States as well, marched into the Finance Committee—the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] will recall that fact—and, representing these great confectioners, they were demanding that we should not place a tariff upon almonds at all, because they could get a second-rate almond from Europe that would enable them to make their confectionery at a little less cost; and so great was the power of these confectioners of the East that it was only by the slightest margin of a very few votes before the Senate itself that we were enabled to obtain the present tariff upon almonds.

So it was upon walnuts. The Senator from Oregon and I stood side by side in making that fight. So it was upon olives and upon olive oil, with which we came in direct competition with our brethren across the sea. It was done, sir, because we organized; and we organized upon the theory that whereas tariff bills had been written in the past around the wants and the wishes and the profits of New England we were going to have, even if injustices might occur in that bill, at least a part of a tariff bill written around the production of the Western States of the United States of America.

I am afraid to touch those schedules now, sir. I would rather go to the relief that ought to be accorded the farmer the other way around, by a specific relief bill; and I will go the limit in that endeavor to give relief to agriculturists. I can not under the circumstances, sir—and I regret it, because of the author of the resolution and because of my sympathy with the fight he is making—I can not, sir, vote for the resolution that he has presented here now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Edge	McMaster	Schall
Bayard	Fess	McNary	Sheppard
Bingham	Frazier	Mayfield	Shipstead
Black	Gerry	Metcalf	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	Neely	Steak
Blease	Hale	Norris	Steiner
Bratton	Harris	Nye	Stephens
Brookhart	Hawes	Oddie	Swanson
Broussard	Hayden	Overman	Thomas
Bruce	Healin	Phipps	Trammell
Capper	Howell	Pittman	Tyson
Caraway	Johnson	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Jones	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	King	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Cutting	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Deneen	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Dill	McLean	Sackett	

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on business of the Senate in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is detained from the Chamber in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] are detained in a meeting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "schedules" and insert the words "excessive rates."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in support of the pending resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter just received by me from Mr. J. K. Wells a constituent of mine residing in Oklahoma City, Okla.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., December 19, 1927.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If I believe that the high protective tariff was good for the West, Middle West, and the South, I would certainly vote the Republican ticket. Not only that, but I would move to Illinois or Iowa and run for Congress, advocating a high protective tariff on both wheat and corn as a means of helping the present deplorable conditions of the farmers. If anyone can show me where a high protective tariff ever benefited any farmer in the South, West, or Middle West, with the exception of the beet-sugar, cane-sugar, rice, and wool-growing farmers, I will make them a present of the best suit of clothes that can be bought in Oklahoma City. The old argument of the protective tariff Republican is that on account of the high tariff schedules the eastern manufacturing industry is enabled to pay higher wages to their employees and consequently they are able to buy the products of the farm and pay more money for them. I will ask you if the highest-paid mechanic in the steel mills of Pittsburgh pays one cent more for a bushel of Kansas wheat than the peasants that sweep the streets of London? You know they pay just the same less the cost of transportation. I will also ask you if the highest-paid textile worker in the mills of New Bedford pays one cent more for a yard of calico spun in their own mills of cotton grown in Jackson County, Okla., than the coolies of China who work for 6 cents per day? You know they pay just the same less the cost of transportation in their favor. I will grant you that by virtue of the high protective tariff the high-wage earners may perhaps buy a little more of the farmer's wheat and a little more of his cotton products, but this is negligible, as you know. Under Cleveland's administration the farmer received on an average of about 65 cents per bushel for his wheat and it cost about 43 cents to produce it. Under Harding's and Coolidge's administrations the farmer has received about \$1 per bushel for his wheat and it has cost about \$1.05 to produce it. Mind you 65 cents under Cleveland's administration is worth about \$1.15 at the present time. It is true that we have a tariff of 14 cents and 28 cents on wheat but it just about as ineffectual as the prohibition law is in Breathitt County, Ky., or in the Bowery district on the east side, New York City. We are producing from 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 bushels of wheat annually and consuming at home about 600,000,000 and exporting about 200,000,000 bushels per annum. This tariff act was passed to fool the farmers of the West and Northwest. Do you think for one moment if we produced only 400,000,000 bushels of wheat annually and had to import 200,000,000 to supply our domestic consumption that the Republicans would retain our present tariff schedules on wheat? Not for one moment. These schedules would be repealed immediately and our President and Senator Smoot would tell the farmers it was all done in their interest to make them more prosperous.

I was both astonished and astounded when I read in the President's message to Congress wherein he said that everything the farmer sold was on the protected list and everything he bought was on the free list when just the opposite is true. I can not for the life of me understand how anyone occupying such an exalted position could so misstate the facts. I also read with considerable interest and astonishment the speeches of Senator REED SMOOT setting forth our prosperous conditions brought about by the high protective act of 1922. Since and including 1922 more than 80 per cent of the banks of the State of Montana have failed, more than 75 per cent of the banks of North Dakota, more than 67 per cent of the banks of South Dakota, more than 55 per cent of the banks of Iowa, more than 20 per cent of the banks of Nebraska, more than 65 per cent of the banks of New Mexico, more than 38 per cent of the banks of Oklahoma, more than 21 per cent of the banks of Kansas, and more than 16 per cent of the banks of Texas have failed; more than 25 per cent of all the farms in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Iowa have been sold on the auction block; more than 1,500,000 farmers moved to the city annually, and tenantry has increased more than 2 per cent annually in this country. I ask you, sir, do you call this prosperity? In 1850, 65 per cent of the population of the United States resided on the farm; now less than 40 per cent reside on the farm. If the country is so prosperous as they would have us believe, why are people leaving the farm so rapidly? I have never yet seen intelligent people run from money or prosperous conditions. Give us five years more of prosperity under the Republican protective tariff and you will have half of the farmers in the South, West and Middle West in the poorhouse.

I will grant you that industry is prosperous, but at the expense of agriculture. I will grant you that transportation is prosperous by vir-

tue of the Esch-Cummins Act, but at the expense of the farmers who constitute the bulwark of American prosperity.

The high protective tariff act is nothing more or less than a highway-robbing scheme to rob the West, Middle West, and Southwest for the benefit of the manufacturing East. I have just as much respect for a highwayman who takes my watch and money away from me in some dark alley with a six-shooter as I have for the Republican administration who robs me through the protective tariff act. One is done in defiance of all law and the other is done with the sanction of law and by virtue of the all-powerful industrial East.

There can be no prosperity for the farmers until the expense of production is decreased through a repeal of the tariff schedules and the placing of farm machinery on the free list, reduction of transportation rates and strict economy in public expenditures.

I hope you and I will live long enough to see the West and Middle West voting for their own financial interest rather than the way the great industrial East wants them to vote. When they wake up they will be voting solidly with the South against the present tariff schedules.

I want to thank you for the December issue of the *Tariff Review* which you recently sent me. I have read every article in it and analyzed carefully the one by Commissioner Brossard on How Farmers are Benefited by the Tariff. To my method of reasoning it is most illogical. The most phenomenal idea in it was the statement that the Tariff Commission, of which Mr. Brossard is a member, after arduous labor, research, and investigation "had reduced the duty on quail from 50 cents to 25 cents on each bird." No doubt this one act of this commission accounts for the prosperous condition of the farmers, as set forth in the President's message to Congress and by various speeches and statements from Senator REED SMOOT. Another such an extraordinary act by this commission in the interest of the farmers and we will have such a plethora of money in circulation throughout the United States, and Oklahoma in particular, that we will no doubt be able to retire our national debt.

I also learned from this article that they likewise "reduced the duty on limberger cheese from 15 cents to 7½ cents per pound," all in the interest of and for the benefit of the farmers. These two acts are the outstanding accomplishments of this commission since it was organized by an act of Congress in 1916, of which all of its members feel justly proud. This is the very quintessence of an efficient and faithful public service. Every epochal event in our national history is incomparable to these major achievements. For these momentous, frugal, laborious, and scientific accomplishments they should be extended the thanks of Congress and immediately retired on full pay. Then let it be said of them as was said of Paul of Tarsus, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; as thou has been faithful over a few things"—lie down and take thy rest. Future generations of agrarians will sing their songs of praise and erect stately monuments to perpetuate their memories down through the corridors of time. "Reduction of duty on quail from 50 cents to 25 cents on each bird," and "on cheese from 15 cents to 7½ cents per pound," the crowning attainment of President Coolidge's administration. I have at last discovered why he is so popular with the farmers and why the country is so prosperous. Ne plus ultra.

I made the statement that the highest-paid mechanic in the steel mills of Pittsburgh paid no more for a bushel of Kansas-grown wheat than the poorest peasant that sweeps the streets of London; and also that he did not necessarily buy any greater quantity of it. In support of this last statement let me quote from the President's recent message to Congress on this very question, quoted verbatim: "Assuming that Europe would have more money if it sold us larger amounts of merchandise, it is not certain it would consume more of our food." These propositions are certainly analogous.

Tariff of every kind and description is nothing more or less than a local subsidy for local industry, meaning higher prices to local consumers. This subsidy is not paid by foreign consumers, for they are not compelled to pay higher prices as we are for the same commodity by virtue of the high protective tariff laws.

Another idea I would like to suggest in this connection and that is: The industries of Europe are at a decided disadvantage in competing in the markets of the United States with the industries of this country. This has been brought about by greater industrial efficiency and mass production methods of the United States, which not only offsets the effect of higher wages paid in this country, but which, as a matter of fact in the majority of instances make the cost per unit of commodities produced in this country less than the cost per unit of similar commodities produced abroad. Therefore, industries of this country can sell these same goods to the consumers at home and abroad cheaper than European industries can sell us similar commodities produced abroad, or even in the very foreign countries where their competitors are the very strongest. As a matter of fact they are doing this very thing each and every day. Do you think they need protection (?) at the expense of the consumer?

Would Senator CAPPER agree that it would be a good thing for the United States, and Kansas in particular, if England, Japan, Germany, and Austria should levy a duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat? It would be effective in this instance cited above, but not in this country

where we export over 200,000,000 bushels annually, while they are the largest importers of wheat.

I trust you agree with the statement in my letter to Senator NYM that no tariff schedule on the raw products of the farm can be effective where we produce same in abundance in excess of domestic consumption. A great many commodities like the raw products of the farm are on the dutiable list, but the law is ineffectual for the reason stated above. And yet, intelligent people fall for the "bunk" that tariff on wheat, corn, cotton, flour, bran, feed products, cottonseed, and many other raw products of the farm, too numerous to mention, is very beneficial to the farmer. It is nothing but sophistry personified. One must contravene their method of reasoning, suppress their initiative, and stultify their conscience to approve and support such an illogical and refutable proposition. These products were placed on the high-dutiable list in order to deceive the farmers and lead them to believe the Republicans are trying to give them the same benefits of the high-protective tariff as now enjoyed by industry.

I am thoroughly sold on the idea of reducing the tariff schedules on all necessities of life and placing farm implements of all kinds on the free list as the most salutary method possible of relieving the present deplorable conditions of agriculture, in addition to a reduction in transportation rates and reduced expenditures in Government. It is a well-known fact that the consumer ultimately pays all fixed charges and taxes, it matters not how and when incurred.

From the gist of our recent correspondence you can readily see that no one could consistently accuse me of being in sympathy with any high protective tariff act, the McNary-Haugen bill, or one containing the same idea.

I want to beg your pardon for taking up so much of your valuable time, but the fact is, this is the last day of the week, month, and year and I have spent the day reading the *Tariff Review*, and while the subject matter is fresh on my mind I thought I would give you my mental reaction to the contents contained therein.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

J. K. WELLS.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there have been several days' debate upon the resolution, and, so far as I know, only one or two Senators have indicated a desire to speak to-morrow, I would like, if possible, to obtain unanimous consent to agree to have a final vote upon the resolution at 2 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. Upon the resolution and all amendments?

Mr. McMASTER. And all amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCE. Would it suit the Senator just as well to change the hour?

Mr. McMASTER. To what hour?

Mr. BRUCE. To some later hour, say, 3 o'clock.

Mr. McMASTER. That would be perfectly agreeable to me. I accept the suggestion and ask that we agree to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maryland is acceptable to him?

Mr. McMASTER. I have not been able to examine the amendment. A slight amendment was made this morning; that is, I suggested this morning that a change be made which I think would cover the amendment the Senator from Maryland proposes.

Mr. BRUCE. The effect of my amendment is to strike out the word "schedules," in line 3 of the resolution, and substitute the words "excessive rates." I understood that that would be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. McMASTER. I will say that this morning the word "excessive" was inserted in the resolution, and I assume the only suggestion the Senator from Maryland makes is that the word "schedules" be changed to "rates." The word "excessive" is already in line 3 of the resolution. It was put in this morning. But we can look at the matter afterwards.

Mr. BRUCE. The resolution now reads:

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such schedules.

Mr. McMASTER. We have inserted the word "excessive" before the word "schedules." Therefore the only word the Senator from Maryland desires to change is the word "schedules," which he desires to change to "rates."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND].

Mr. BRUCE. That amendment was to put the word "excessive" before the word "schedules," in line 3, was it not?

Mr. McMASTER. It was.

Mr. BRUCE. The effect would be just the same.

Mr. SMOOT. If the word "schedules" is used, it may be found that there are rates in a schedule that are too low and other rates that are too high. I am sure that will appear to the Senator himself.

Mr. McMASTER. That is why it is perfectly agreeable to me to insert the word "rates" instead of the word "schedules."

Mr. BRUCE. With my amendment the resolution would read:

Resolved, That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive rates.

Mr. McMASTER. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BRUCE. I was sure it would be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota accepts the modification, and the resolution will be modified as suggested.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. The unanimous-consent agreement is that we vote at 3 o'clock on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At 3 o'clock on Monday.

The agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at 3 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of Monday, January 16, 1928, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the resolution (S. Res. 52) favoring a reduction of tariff schedules and the consideration of tariff legislation at the present session of Congress, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order, now that this agreement has been made, to move to take up another bill? That is, would it displace the present unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the hour of 3 o'clock on Monday the resolution will be voted upon; but a motion would be in order before that time.

Mr. JONES. I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 38, Senate bill 744, to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes. I will state that if this motion shall be agreed to I will ask unanimous consent temporarily to lay the bill aside. I do not desire to displace the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that there are several Senators who have expressed a desire to speak upon the pending resolution, and one or two of them were ready to address the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. JONES. My motion would not prevent them from speaking on the resolution. I would have the merchant marine bill laid aside temporarily.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Senator from Washington will not insist on the motion this afternoon. A couple of Senators who are not now in the Chamber are opposed to the measure, and they spoke to me about it.

Mr. JONES. I would not interfere with them. I will temporarily lay the bill aside.

Mr. CURTIS. I know; but I think they would like to be here when the question is up as to whether the bill should be made the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES. I desire to give notice, then, that immediately after the vote is taken on the pending resolution, I shall seek recognition from the Chair to move to take up this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] as modified.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement, I suggest that we have an executive session, if no one wants to speak on the resolution now.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 14, 1928, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13 (legislative day of January 11), 1928

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Reese Q. Lillard, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal, middle district of Tennessee. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Douglas Potts, Infantry, from January 9, 1928.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Lesley James McNair, Field Artillery, from January 9, 1928.

To be majors

Capt. Frederick William Huntington, Infantry, from December 14, 1927.

Capt. Howard J. Houghland, Air Corps, from December 15, 1927.

Capt. John James Bohn, Cavalry, from December 15, 1927.

Capt. Roland Roy Long, Infantry, from December 18, 1927.

Capt. Charles Belding Oldfield, Air Corps, from December 20, 1927.

Capt. Carl J. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 20, 1927.

Capt. Charles Joseph Allen, Infantry, from December 21, 1927, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John Lawrence Dunn, Infantry, from December 22, 1927.

Capt. James Gregory Monihan, Cavalry, from December 25, 1927.

Capt. William Gaston Simmons, Cavalry, from December 25, 1927.

Capt. Charles Andrew McGarrigle, Quartermaster Corps, from December 29, 1927.

Capt. Alexander Putney Withers, Infantry, from January 9, 1928.

To be captains

First Lieut. Arthur Eugene Fox, Field Artillery, from December 14, 1927.

First Lieut. Carleton Smith, Infantry, from December 14, 1927.

First Lieut. Paul Conover Gripper, Signal Corps, from December 15, 1927.

First Lieut. LeCount Haynes Slocum, Field Artillery, from December 15, 1927.

First Lieut. Edwin Fry Barry, Ordnance Department, from December 17, 1927.

First Lieut. Frederick Harry Black, Field Artillery, from December 18, 1927.

First Lieut. Josef Robert Sheetz, Field Artillery, from December 18, 1927.

First Lieut. Charles Paul Cullen, Infantry, from December 19, 1927.

First Lieut. Frederic Arthur Metcalf, Field Artillery, from December 20, 1927.

First Lieut. Harry Emerson Storms, Signal Corps, from December 20, 1927.

First Lieut. David Dean Barrett, Infantry, from December 21, 1927.

First Lieut. Lawrence James Meyns, Ordnance Department, from December 22, 1927.

First Lieut. Thomas Harry Ramsey, Infantry, from December 25, 1927.

First Lieut. Leon Dessez, Field Artillery, from December 25, 1927.

First Lieut. Lawrence Iverson, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 28, 1927.

First Lieut. Archibald Luther Parmelee, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1927.

First Lieut. Walter Byron Fariss, Infantry, from December 31, 1927.

First Lieut. John Patrick Crehan, Field Artillery, from January 4, 1928.

First Lieut. Donald Sutter McConnaughy, Field Artillery, from January 6, 1928.

First Lieut. John Theodore Sunstone, Infantry, from January 9, 1928.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Will Walter White, Air Corps, from December 13, 1927.

Second Lieut. William Jackson Morton, jr., Signal Corps, from December 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. Wilbur Ray Pierce, Field Artillery, from December 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. Donald Henry Galloway, Cavalry, from December 15, 1927.

Second Lieut. Howard William Serig, Signal Corps, from December 15, 1927.

Second Lieut. Daniel De Bardeleben, Cavalry, from December 17, 1927.

Second Lieut. Patrick Weston Timberlake, Field Artillery, from December 18, 1927.

Second Lieut. Clyde Kenneth Rich, Air Corps, from December 18, 1927.

Second Lieut. Paul Wakefield Wolf, Air Corps, from December 19, 1927.

Second Lieut. David Larr, Field Artillery, from December 20, 1927.

Second Lieut. Laurence Carbee Craigie, Air Corps, from December 20, 1927.

Second Lieut. Philip Roy Dwyer, Infantry, from December 21, 1927.

Second Lieut. Sylvester John Keane, Signal Corps, from December 22, 1927.

Second Lieut. Allen Lloyd Keyes, Field Artillery, from December 25, 1927.

Second Lieut. Damon Mott Gunn, Infantry, from December 25, 1927.

Second Lieut. Charles Metz Seebach, Infantry, from December 28, 1927.

Second Lieut. Harry McKenzie Roper, Field Artillery, from December 29, 1927.

Second Lieut. James Henry Workman, Field Artillery, December 31, 1927.

Second Lieut. Charles Wesley Gettys, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 4, 1928.

Second Lieut. Henry James Pitt Harding, Infantry, from January 6, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Shepard Biddle, 3d, Cavalry, January 9, 1928.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. William Lawson Little, Medical Corps, from January 6, 1928.

Lieut. Col. Allie Walter Williams, Medical Corps, from January 6, 1928.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 13 (legislative day of January 11), 1928

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE VICE CONSULS OF CAREER

Howard F. Diehl.	Comer Howell.
Richard C. Dutrow.	Odin G. Loren.
George M. Graves.	James S. Moose, jr.
Randolph Harrison, jr.	Charles K. Morris.

UNCLASSIFIED

Howard F. Diehl.	Comer Howell.
Richard C. Dutrow.	Odin G. Loren.
George M. Graves.	James S. Moose, jr.
Randolph Harrison, jr.	Charles K. Morris.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Clifford M. Cox, Ozark.

ARIZONA

William F. Haas, Naco.

INDIANA

John T. Clapp, Beech Grove.
Charles F. Robertson, Brownstown.
Julia V. Clark, Colfax.
Ebert Garrigues, Francesville.
Ralph D. Gookins, Veedersburg.

IOWA

Fred O. Canfield, Dunkerton.
Andrew C. Link, Dyersville.
Eliza K. Alldredge, Melbourne.
George C. Parsons, Perry.
Nellie Hyde, Rowan.

Chester C. Yelland, Sheffield.
Mary J. Morse, Steamboat Rock.
John A. Hale, Tripoll.

LOUISIANA

Thomas L. Ducrest, Broussard.
J. Rodney Murrel, Church Point.
Robert M. Johnson, Colfax.
Ralph N. Menetre, Covington.
George W. Varnado, Franklinton.
Edward F. Crawford, Gretna.
Shep B. Hanes, Jena.
Lilha B. Brown, Lecompte.
William R. Morgan, Mandeville.
Novilla T. King, Simsboro.
Walter B. Eisely, Tallulah.
Louis Hebert, White Castle.

MARYLAND

William A. Brown, Cecilton.

MASSACHUSETTS

William F. Keller, Holliston.
George A. Coolidge, Hudson.
Leon C. W. Foote, Lee.
Ernest H. Wilcox, Manchester.
Turner R. Bailey, Medfield.
Bernard Campbell, Millville.
Charles D. Streeter, Mount Hermon.
Harold Winslow, New Bedford.
George W. Orcutt, North Abington.
James T. Potter, North Adams.
Alice K. Briggs, North Easton.
Alonzo W. Jones, Orleans.
Palmer J. Lord, Petersham.
Margaret E. Rourke, Prides Crossing.
Mark A. Putnam, Rutland.
William E. Chaffin, Scituate.
Edward L. Chapin, Southbridge.
Wesley G. Rose, South Deerfield.
Maurice Williams, South Easton.
John H. Preston, South Hadley.
Susan F. Twiss, Three Rivers.
Frederick C. Haigis, Turners Falls.
Otis J. A. Dionne, Walpole.
Blanche E. Robinson, Wareham.
Thomas E. Hynes, Wayland.
Alexander Wylie, Webster.
George D. Roe, Westfield.
Henry O. Bailey, West Newbury.
Mary A. Fallon, West Stockbridge.
W. C. Arthur Hebert, West Warren.

MISSOURI

Lester H. Pettit, Ava.
Verner H. Kirkendall, Birch Tree.
Nellie B. Gallihugh, Blairstown.
George C. Blackwell, Breckenridge.
Joe D. Scott, Bunceton.
Edward J. Schmidt, Centralia.
Anna B. Thomas, Corder.
Gustave R. Baumann, Creve Coeur.
Bransby B. Houghton, Crystal City.
Harry C. Grant, Cuba.
Percy B. Kidney, Darlington.
Sallie F. Duncan, Dearborn.
Mandana A. Schriefer, Fornefeld.
Isaac H. Arnold, Forsyth.
Thomas A. Scott, Greenfield.
William B. Green, Goodman.
George Scott, Higginsville.
John W. Rissler, Houstonia.
Joseph Q. Martin, Huntsville.
Maurice Craig, Ilmo.
Joseph C. Forshee, Ironton.
John G. Kies, Jackson.
Victor M. Blankinship, Kennett.
Hugh L. Virtue, Kingston.
Oliver H. Simmons, Lancaster.
Clyde H. Turner, Mansfield.
Henry H. Jones, Memphis.
Charles S. Dickson, Milan.
John M. Medcalf, Monroe City.
Howard W. Mills, Mound City.

Lulu Ketrow, Mount Washington.
 Ray R. Kelly, New Hampton.
 Celia F. Kerr, New Madrid.
 Eugene E. Wyatt, Oak Grove.
 Sam S. Rutan, Odessa.
 Frank L. Zeller, Oregon.
 Henry O. Hopp, Oronogo.
 Amy B. Buchard, Owensville.
 Bruce C. Maples, Ozark.
 Jesse A. Linthacum, Ridgeway.
 Lou A. Slade, Rocheport.
 Lester S. Eddings, Rogersville.
 Alfred A. Smith, Rolla.
 Luster C. Cottrill, Savannah.
 Rufus G. Beezley, Steelville.
 Waldo E. Andrew, Sweet Springs.
 Estel G. Crawford, Tipton.
 Fletcher G. Smart, Webb City.
 Artie B. Keadle, Wellsville.
 Archie T. Hollenbeck, West Plains.

NEBRASKA

Fred H. Carlson, Alliance.
 Lewis A. Wight, Gibbon.
 John S. Myers, Grant.
 Joseph H. Harrison, Ravenna.

OKLAHOMA

James K. Malone, Allen.
 William S. Sibley, Arnett.
 R. Julian Miller, Bokchito.
 John R. McIntosh, Chelsea.
 Downey Milburn, Coweta.
 John W. Brookman, Coyle.
 Leroy J. Myers, Dustin.
 John W. Bishop, Fairview.
 Thomas H. Henderson, Fort Cobb.
 Frederick M. Deselms, Guthrie.
 Isom P. Clark, Heavener.
 Alfred J. Canon, Hinton.
 Susie M. Daniel, Jet.
 Noah B. Hays, Keota.
 Roy Sherman, Lexington.
 John A. Norris, Okeene.
 William G. Johnston, Oklahoma City.
 Charles H. Johnson, Pawnee.
 Howard Morris, Soper.
 Virgil T. Gannaway, Tuttle.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Schwarztrauber, Archbald.
 Annabelle Busler, Avis.
 Harry M. Logan, Conshohocken.
 John E. Cronk, Duke Center.
 Wallace W. Scowden, Farrell.
 George W. Larkins, Ford City.
 Claude W. Keiser, Lykens.
 John L. Eppley, Mechanicsburg.
 M. Irene Workman, Mingoville.
 Howard C. Emigh, Morrisdale.
 John W. Clouse, Moscow.
 Samuel J. Matthews, Olyphant.
 Nora L. Pickering, Peckville.
 Samuel H. Wigton, Phillipsburg.
 Anna B. McCully, Ramey.

VERMONT

Frank E. Robinson, Barre.
 Joshua H. Blakley, Bellows Falls.
 Stanley E. Brownell, Burlington.
 Douglas C. Montgomery, East Arlington.
 Lyman H. Leach, Essex Junction.
 Dora W. Brown, Lunenburg.
 Murray K. Paris, Lyndon.
 Walter W. Wright, North Troy.
 Edward H. Willis, Pittsford.
 Charles W. Humphrey, Poultney.
 Ernest W. Chase, Rochester.
 Earle H. Bishop, West Rutland.
 Belle H. Covell, Williamstown.

WISCONSIN

Theodore B. Ottum, McFarland.
 Walter F. Martin, Mukwonago.
 Mourits Mortenson, Stratford.
 Melvin H. Schlytter, Wittenberg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 13, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day, for health, for happy friendships, for the open sky, for the wide earth; but we pray for the greatest wealth—the blessing of an undefiled heart. May the hand that bears all nature up protect our homes and shield us from the enemy that never abdicates. Thou who art our sovereign Friend, from whom earth's greatest souls have borrowed all their gifts, bless us with music without discord, with purity without stain, and with that peace which is far beyond human analysis. Wherever there are ignorance and restless passion, do Thou shed Thy light and bestow Thy strength. May we hate injustice, smite falsehood, and be consumed with a passion for righteousness, for the glory of Thy name, and for the good of our country. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FRANK H. FOSS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FITCHBURG, MASS., January 12, 1928.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker House of Representatives.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to Resolution 78, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect FRANK H. FOSS, of the third district of the State of Massachusetts, I have the honor to report that on the 12th day of January, 1928, at his residence in Fitchburg, Mass., I administered the oath of office to Mr. Foss; form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. Foss subscribed.

I have the honor to be,
 Yours respectfully,

CALVIN D. PAIGE.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 90

Whereas FRANK H. FOSS, a Representative for the State of Massachusetts, from the third district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed the oath of office before the Hon. Calvin D. Paige, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said FRANK H. FOSS as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Civil Service may sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Civil Service may sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN McDUFFIE

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of last year my colleague, Congressman McDUFFIE, made a very interesting and instructive speech before the Alabama Bar Association on the dangerous tendencies in our Government. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOHN McDUFFIE:

DANGEROUS TENDENCIES IN OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Bar Association of Alabama, I wish to express my appreciation of the honor done me by the invita-

tion to address this association. From the early days of our statehood the Alabama bar has held a high place in the esteem of the legal profession of the Nation. First State in the Union to adopt a code of ethics—largely the work of the late lamented Thomas G. Jones, of Montgomery—which has been followed by at least a dozen other States, and made the basis of the ethical canons of the American bar, Alabama has always been a leader in every movement to preserve the integrity of that profession which, more than any other, has had to do with the making and maintenance of the principles of the American Government.

I wish to assure you in the beginning, I have not come with any delusion that I could bring to this audience a message of wisdom and advice. I see before me those at whose feet I have sat, and those who possess that rare ability which makes them upstanding figures in the legal profession. I do venture, however, even at the risk of presumption on my part, to speak to you about those tendencies in our Government, which, if allowed to run their course unrestrained, will destroy our constitutional equilibrium—that even balance between State and Federal Government which has been the bulwark of our safety and the anchor sheet of the Republic. Our dual system of Government as provided in the Constitution, has been fitly termed "the longest reach of constructive statesmanship ever known in the world."

The tendency toward the surrender and elimination of the sovereign powers of the State, as well as the encroachment of Federal power, is destroying the incentive of local government, and striking down the initiative of the individual citizen; it is setting up in Washington an unbalanced and top-heavy system and gradually undermining the foundations of representative government.

BUREAUCRACY

According to Mr. Hoover, we now have more than 200 bureaus, boards, and commissions, great and small, with authority to make rules and regulations, largely fixing the policies of government under which we live. A great bureaucracy clothed with much authority and little responsibility, not only adds to the taxpayers' burden but through the dispensation of governmental favors, our people are encouraged to lean upon the Government for support rather than support the Government. To-day almost a decade after the close of the World War, Federal bureaus are still reaching out and putting their hands into numerous phases of the social and business life of the Nation. With increasing rapidity they are entering new fields every year for the performance of many duties which are more properly the functions of State and local governments. When once a Federal bureau enters any field with its powerful agencies, supported by the Public Treasury, it rarely, if ever, halts or turns backward but follows a natural course of expansion.

FEDERAL FUNCTIONS ENLARGED BY NATION'S GROWTH

Until 30 years ago, excepting the period of the War between the States, the activities of the Federal Government and its direct relation to the citizen aroused only the slightest interest in the minds of the people. To-day, however, a survey of the various functions of the many bureaus, boards, and commissions of the central Government presents a most engaging study.

Appropriations by the Federal Government for internal improvements were questioned long ago by President Madison, who vetoed a bill for the construction of the Cumberland Road, and in this he was followed by Mr. Monroe. In 1844 President Tyler likewise protested that Congress had no constitutional authority to use Federal funds for improvement of navigable channels in our rivers and harbors. Soon, however, we find Congress even granting vast areas of the public domain to aid in the construction of our great trunk line railroads. Such improvements with their strategic, economic, and political value were most essential for our national development, and with the passing of the years the pressure of public opinion accompanying our rapid growth has wrought reversals as well as many changes in the original ideas of the functions of the Federal Government. Annually increasing appropriations, not only for internal improvements but to meet the growing demands from every section of the country for the multiplication of bureau agencies to assist in solving the problems of the every-day life of the citizen, have been granted from year to year by the Congress, always ready to respond to the wishes of the people.

To-day it is almost impossible to conceive of a single phase of American life that does not feel the touch of the Government's hand or that is not affected by some regulation of a Federal bureau. Those of you gentlemen who came here to-day in automobiles traveled over roads that were constructed with the aid of funds of a Federal bureau, which even tested the material of which they are built, said the final word as to their proper location, and now advises how best to maintain them. Those who came on the railroads paid fares that are fixed by a bureau in Washington. Even your wearing apparel, from your hat to your shoes, including your spectacles, whether domestic or imported, was doubtless sold to you at a price responsive to a tariff rate made by the Federal Congress, but very likely adjusted by a commission in Washington. If your pockets are bulging with the coin of the realm, sooner or later the hand of a Federal bureau will reach in for its share of the income derived from your energy and industry. A Federal bureau expends millions annually for the reclamation of arid land, but prescribes, of course, the conditions under which those lands are used.

Another bureau will lend you money on your farm land at a low rate of interest for a term of 40 years. A bureau will advise you how to build your home, even to the extent of where the kitchen should be. It will not only tell you what sort of flowers to plant but will occasionally send you a few to make your home more beautiful. A bureau tells you what kind of soil yours is and suggests the best methods of cultivation. It advises what amount and the kind of fertilizer to use and suggests how you can safeguard your premises against rats, insects, worms, beetles, and bugs. A bureau will advise you when, where, and what to plant, and, before the crop is grown, what the harvest will be. It teaches how to best transport the crop as well as the latest methods of marketing both at home and abroad. In many marketing centers throughout the land the expert eye of a Federal bureau inspects the fruit and vegetables for your table, the meat you eat, the butter and eggs you buy, and even the grass you grow. A Federal bureau tells us when the sun will shine, when the rain will fall, and warns us against tornadoes. Under the cotton futures act, the cotton standards act, the grain futures act, and the grain standards act, the standard containers act, the United States warehouse act, and the cooperative marketing act, the plant and animal quarantine acts, the pure food and the apple grading act, almost every phase of legal protection and assistance is thrown about the 30,000,000 of our people now engaged in agriculture. Indeed, the Government, through its bureaus, does almost everything except perform the labor and fix the prices of products, and there are those who now declare that regulation of prices by a bureau in Washington is a proper function of the Federal Government.

These are only a few of the multiplied activities of a beneficent Federal Government. The limitations of this hour will not permit me to name them all. Suffice it to say that many other interests in commerce and in the arts and sciences come in daily for their share of advice and supervision and for those bounties provided by the Federal Government to-day.

Mr. Coolidge, with his characteristic New England thrift and economy, very wisely suggested that the task uppermost in the minds of those "whose brains laid here the foundation for the hope of the world" was to see how much they could put into the Government, while it seems the thought uppermost in our mind is to find out how much we can get out of it.

SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT DEMANDING FURTHER EXTENSION OF FEDERAL POWER

Not content with all those powers for the advice and supervision of the business and social life of America to-day there are men and women, sincere but misguided, who are clamoring for further extension of Federal power. There is a school of thought demanding Government ownership and operation of railroads, coal mines, and other public utilities, despite the fact that the Government has never successfully operated any business without a loss to the Public Treasury.

There is a growing demand throughout the Nation for more bureaucratic control and more Federal supervision over the very person and conduct of the citizen himself. Even here in the Southland, where so much precious blood was spilled to preserve the integrity of State and local government, there are those who would all too quickly surrender to the Federal Government many duties and responsibilities which should be performed by State and local communities as well as in the home.

Under the maternity act a Federal bureau now advises the best methods as to how our children should be born, while under a scheme for birth control, not yet adopted, thank God, we might be advised whether or not it is wise to have them born at all.

Another proposal is to amend the Constitution and have the Congress provide a uniform marriage and divorce law for the Nation. Under the provisions of the twentieth amendment, which was unwisely, in my humble opinion, submitted to the States, and which they had the patriotism and courage to reject, some agent of the Federal Government might have been clothed with authority to go into the homes of the people regardless of the wishes of parents, and prescribe those rules and regulations, in conformity with the views of the professional reformer and social uplifter, governing the conditions under which the child, from its tender years almost to the date of majority, should be permitted to labor.

There was a time when we found inscriptions of tender and beautiful sentiment, such as "God bless our home" and "What is home without a mother," hanging about the firesides of our people. But, if the National Congress responds to such dangerous propaganda as involved in the twentieth amendment, and lends a willing ear to the unsound preachments of the well organized and sincere but misdirected zeal of a fanatical type of the sociologist, the time will come when, supplementing the sweet sentiment of "God bless our home" and "What is home without a mother" we will find inscribed about the hearthstones and over the portals of American homes, the later day, the ultraprogressive and Russianized sentiment, "May the Government bless our home" and "What is home without a Federal agent." No; the day will not come soon when the red-blooded American, who enjoys the protection of life and property as well as the immunity and safety of home, guaranteed under the Constitution, will surrender to some bureaucrat of the Federal Government the power to invade the sacred precincts of his home, so long as it is maintained as a home, without injury to his

neighbor or hurt to society. Let us hope the American citizen is not forgetting the assuring words of the great Pitt, describing that Anglo-Saxon ideal which has come down through all the cycles of the years to add to the blessings of our constitutional liberties: "The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail, its roof may shake; the winds may blow through it; the storms may enter; the rain may enter; but the King of England can not enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

FEDERAL SUPERVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Not satisfied with the local support in the education of our children, a problem that was distinctly left by the founders of the Republic for solution by communities and States; not content with the present Federal Bureau of Education with its nine divisions in Washington, there is another school of thought throughout the country demanding the establishment of a new department in the Central Government, to be known as the department of education. Another powerful bureau, if you please, to sit in Washington and sooner or later dictate, not only the type of school your child shall attend, but the courses of study he must pursue, and even who his classmates shall be. Some may persuade themselves that the only function, under the terms of this bill, to be performed by Federal authority is the simple and beneficent process of passing out annually millions of dollars to the States, but I challenge them to cite a single instance wherein the Federal Government has appropriated its funds without reserving to itself the last word as to how those funds shall be expended. Nor can we object to the reason and sound business judgment involved in the fact that wherever the Federal Government places its money, there it lays its hands.

LET US BE PROGRESSIVE, NOT ULTRA-PROGRESSIVE

We glory in the marvelous achievements wrought within a century and a half by the intrepid genius of the American people laboring under the inspiration and light of liberty and religion. We glory in the accumulation of our vast national wealth, in our prowess upon land, upon sea, and in the air; we glory in our position of world leadership. But we should remember that vast wealth and power always teem with temptation and prosperity is full of peril. We can not stand still in America. All the mighty wheels of progress must continue to revolve. We must be progressive; we must advocate legislation and those changes in our Constitution necessary to meet new conditions in the onward march of American civilization. But this does not mean we must approve such radical proposals as those demanding that legislative enactment override the solemn declaration of the Supreme Court; it does not mean that our Government must function only by initiative referendum and recall; it does not mean that we should have any class superior to the Government in this country, for when such an hour comes, the boasted freedom of America will be destroyed; it does not mean that we must progress upon the theory that we can "make the poor man rich by making the rich man poor," for governments, like individuals, develop and progress only through a process of building up rather than one of tearing down; it does not mean that we must change from representative government to pure democracy in America.

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

We are not unmindful that in our rapid, economic, and industrial growth it was essential to enlarge the scope of Federal authority, but have we not reached the point in our national life where discretion and sound judgment dictates to us the stern necessity of checking the tendency to centralization and that increasing paternalism which may eventually destroy our self-reliance, if not make wards of us all? If the history of the world teaches one lesson better than another, it is that an over centralized government with its increasing hordes of officeholders becomes arrogant or intolerable, and sooner or later falls of its own weight. When we realize that, including Federal, State, county, and municipal Governments in the American Republic, for every 11 citizens over the age of 14 years, one is on a public pay roll of some character; we might well pause and ask ourselves the question, "Whither are we drifting?"

Instead of being a "government of law," as described by Webster in a debate with Hayne, this Republic is becoming a "government of laws." Almost daily we meet men and women clamoring for a "law for this" and a "law to prevent that." Shall the day come when all of our personal and domestic relations, as well as our business, will be regulated by some statute? It is estimated that we now have in America more than 2,000,000 laws, theoretically in force, regulating almost every phase of human life, while our National and State Legislatures are grinding out new statutes at an estimated rate of 15,000 a year. He was not far wrong who said that we are almost "law mad" in America, and that the "American people have more laws and obey them less than any other people in the world." After all, the future of American citizenship depends more upon the ideals maintained in the American home than upon thousands of newly made laws.

INCREASING DEMANDS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Within recent years a new impetus has been given to a tendency to radically change the fundamental law of the land. From 1789 to date there have been more than 2,000 resolutions proposing approximately

3,000 amendments to the Constitution. Between 1804 and 1860 these proposals averaged only about seven each year. Since 1889 this number increased to an average of about 30 a year, while in the Sixty-seventh Congress there were 103; in the Sixty-eighth Congress there were 87, and in the Sixty-ninth Congress about 60 resolutions proposing various and sundry amendments. These figures tell the story of an unending struggle to preserve the integrity of the Constitution. While some of those resolutions proposed changes that are doubtless needed, affecting the temporary and incidental provisions of the Constitution, many of them reveal the dangerous tendency to change those eternal and bedrock principles which need "no more change than the rules of simple arithmetic." Many of these proposals reflect a dangerous desire to turn from representative government to a pure democracy. A democracy is the only thing of which I can conceive that grows worse as it approaches purity. With her industry almost paralyzed, the morale of her people broken, the respect of leading nations lost; trying to confuse and drag down other peoples in her own muck and mire, Russia stands out to-day as the latest experiment in pure democracy. Let it be said to the credit of the political genius of the American people that of all the vast array of proposals to amend the Constitution only 19 have been adopted within the long span of 138 years of our national life.

ONLY THREE ENEMIES OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

There are but three enemies of the Constitution in the United States. These are ignorance, indifference, and selfishness. The average American inherently respects the Constitution, even though he may not have studied all of its provisions. Like a study of the Bible, 10 minutes study of the Constitution by the most depraved citizen will make of him a better man. The indifferent and ignorant may be aroused and taught, but the self-serving and class interests are dangerous to our ideals and institutions. The great force of a crystallized public opinion has always maintained or destroyed civilization and it will likewise preserve or destroy our Constitution. An enlightened, virile, and patriotic public opinion, therefore, must continue to be the safeguard of this Republic.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CONSTITUTION SHOULD BE STUDIED

The Constitution of the United States should be made a part of the curriculum of every school in the land. Our youth should be taught not only its simple language, which even the child can understand, but they should learn of its historic background. They should study the lives of its inspired makers, and realize that they were the "greatest architects in governmental structure" in all the history of the world. Behind those closed doors in that great Philadelphia convention hall were men of experience, historians, and scholars of great renown. There were graduates from Princeton, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and some who had trained under Blackstone himself, while many had been Members of the Continental Congress. In laying the foundation for the world's last and fairest dream of human liberty truly was it said that those men acted "without the cunning of the politician or the cowardice of the demagogue." They knew the dismal story of Florence and Venice as they crumbled and faded away. They sought to avoid those baneful influences which tore Athens into fragments and conquered Imperial Rome. Above all things, they were careful to provide the safeguards of representative government and lasting barriers against a pure democracy. That continuing conflict which began in Philadelphia in 1787; that cause which might fitly be styled "A Republic v. A Pure Democracy" is still on trial before the bar of American civilization.

THINK ON THESE THINGS

The time has come for the American people to renew their faith in our form of representative government and consecrate themselves to the preservation of its fundamental principles. The mind and conscience of our States must be quickened to their high duties and responsibilities if we are to preserve intact the integrity of State governments.

Avoiding the doctrine that the Constitution is too sacred to be amended in any of its parts, the thoughtful citizenship of this country must see to it that only those changes are made which are in harmony with the original purposes of that great document. Let us bear in mind the Biblical injunction: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set."

It is refreshing that in recent years campaigns in behalf of the Constitution have been waged and warnings sounded against the tendencies to centralize the powers of government. The President in his Arlington address said: "We may wonder that it is necessary to reiterate and defend the fundamentals of our Government, yet the principles of government have the same need for reinforcement and support that characterizes the principles of religion." Paul in exhorting the Philippians said: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." If we are to preserve for posterity the ideals and institutions of America, we should follow the advice of the great apostle and think on these things.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday, January 21, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of papers on the Speaker's desk,

Major STEDMAN, of North Carolina, may have 10 minutes in which to address the House on General Forrest, the great Confederate cavalry leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that on Saturday, January 21, immediately after reading of the Journal and disposition of papers on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. STEDMAN] may have leave to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARTICLE BY HON. VICTOR L. BERGER

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER] on the subject of world peace.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I print in the RECORD an article by Hon. VICTOR L. BERGER on "World conditions for peace," which was published in Current History for January as part of a symposium of "Views of American statesmen."

The article is as follows:

WORLD CONDITIONS FOR PEACE

Mr. Steed wants a declaration by the "accredited spokesman" of the United States that if members of the League of Nations should ever take action against an aggressor nation, America would stand by the league.

The "accredited spokesman" can not do it.

TWO REASONS WHY IT CAN NOT BE DONE

Apart from our traditional American policy, from which our country has deviated only once—that is, during the World War—there are two tremendous obstacles in the way: First, the "treaty" of Versailles, which is a pact of hate and perpetuates hate, and to which we can not become a party, and, second, the competition for the world's markets is bound to create serious dissension between Great Britain and America within a generation, unless there is a strong Socialist Party in our country similar to the Labor Party in England. Diplomatic declarations are worse than useless.

To begin with, by promulgating the "world Monroe doctrine" that Mr. Steed suggests, we would in fact guarantee the "status quo post bellum"—guarantee the condition created by the pact of Versailles, which our Senate rejected.

Mr. Steed virtually wants us to underwrite the decisions of the League of Nations in which we have neither seat nor voice, according to a solemn referendum of our people. Underwrite only the righteous decisions, of course. But undoubtedly the decisions that Great Britain favors will always be "righteous" since this declaration is to be made at the behest of England, which has six seats in the League of Nations. The other side will always be the aggressor. We know history.

UNITED STATES TO BE WORLD CONSTABLE

And the United States is to act the part of a world constable. A peaceable constable, but—we know history. That constable is apt to turn into a highwayman.

The so-called treaty of Versailles now serves as the "legal" basis of all the transactions of Europe. The pact of Versailles is the "world's charter" and the League of Nations was simply created in Versailles as an instrument of the pact. Ask Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Poincaré, etc.

This pact of Versailles, which is the quintessence of 1,000 years of European hatreds and jealousies, is at the bottom of all the troubles of Europe, including the troubles of England, which are far more serious than the world knows. Why should America indorse it by standing behind the decisions of the League of Nations?

Until that infamous pact is scrapped Europe can have no peace and England no prosperity. And it makes not a particle of difference what kind of a new theory the President of the United States might promulgate at this time or any other time.

As to the troubles which are certain to arise between Great Britain and America on account of the competition for the world's markets—more later.

NATIONS MUST PAY PRICE FOR SUPREME CRIME AGAINST CIVILIZATION

Let us but clearly understand that the European nations—and particularly England—are paying the price for the World War. Great Britain can not expect to take part with extraordinary stupidity in the greatest crime against civilization without having to pay for it. The price may be England's position as a world empire, and it may be less. That depends on England's wisdom or England's luck. But England must pay the price. All of Europe has to pay the price. And even America is beginning to pay. Ask our farmers.

AMOUNT OF THE BIG BUTCHER BILL ANALYZED

And here is the bill:

According to the best statistics obtainable, the World War cost 30,000,000 lives and \$400,000,000,000 in property.

In order to give some idea of what this means, just let me illustrate it in the following:

With that amount we could have built a \$2,500 house and furnished this house with \$1,000 worth of furniture and placed it on 5 acres of land worth \$100 an acre and given all this to each and every family in the United States of America, Canada, Australia, England, Wales, Ireland, Scotland, France, Belgium, Germany, and Russia.

After doing this there would be enough money left to give each city of 200,000 inhabitants and over in all the countries named a \$5,000,000 library, a \$5,000,000 hospital, and a \$10,000,000 university.

And then out of the balance we could still have sufficient money to set aside a sum at 5 per cent interest which would pay for all time to come a \$1,000 yearly salary for each of an army of 125,000 teachers, and in addition to this to pay the same salary to each of an army of 125,000 nurses.

And, after having done all this, we could still have enough left out of our \$400,000,000,000 to buy up all of France and Belgium and everything of value that France and Belgium possess; that is, every French and Belgian farm, home, factory, church, railroad, street car—in fact, everything of value in those two countries in 1914.

For it must be remembered that the total valuation of France in 1914, according to French official figures, was \$62,000,000,000.

The total of Belgium, according to Belgian official figures, was in the neighborhood of \$12,000,000,000. This means a total valuation of the two countries in 1914 of less than \$75,000,000,000.

In other words, the price which the leaders and statesmen of the entente, including the "statesmen" of the United States, made the people of the world pay for the victory over Germany, was equal to the value of five countries like France, plus five countries like Belgium.

WHY ENGLAND JOINED THE "CRUSADE"

And all this was done in order to preserve Great Britain's preponderance in the world's trade and to make France the foremost military power in the world's history—limited only by her terrific indebtedness and inability to borrow much more money. Great Britain could have prevented the war, but Great Britain, jealous of Germany's progress, joined the "crusade."

The most cruel part of the World War was not the ordeal of battle, nor the want which the German people especially had to suffer during the fighting, because they were surrounded by an iron ring. The most cruel part was the hunger blockade after the war, for six months after the armistice had been signed. And in that beastly and inhuman blockade not only Great Britain but also the United States took part.

Hundreds of thousands of Germans—mainly old people, women, and children—perished. This was one of the most dastardly and cruel acts of the Wilson administration. It was accomplished after Germany had laid down her arms on the so-called 14 points. These "14 points," however, were never even mentioned at the peace negotiations at Versailles.

THE ROBBER PACT OF VERSAILLES

And the results of that treaty of Versailles?

The Allies, and especially France, took everything Germany possessed not only in war material, machinery, and rolling stock but also horses, cows, etc.

The Reparation Commission established "reparations" regardless of any promises made in the armistice, and fixed no definite sum which Germany is to pay.

This peace of Versailles divided up 15,000,000 Germans among the hostile neighbors like sheep to be slaughtered. Are we to become a party to this?

Central Europe was Balkanized. The Allies took all the German colonies.

A number of new countries were founded, all of them satellites of France, each of them with a big standing army organized by Frenchmen.

The peace of Versailles helped to build up a monster Frankenstein in militaristic France and a number of smaller Frankensteins of the same kind in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Rumania.

GERMANY'S PAUPER LABOR DANGER TO WORLD

On the other hand, the Germans, a nation which a few years ago was the foremost in the world in power, civilization, learning, art, and commerce, has to-day become a beggar folk. Their very poverty, coupled with the necessity to work cheaply in order to be able to pay the tribute, makes them a peril—German workmen get about one-fourth what American workmen do and less than one-half of the English workmen—and with their talent for organization this cheap German labor has become a danger to the labor of all other industrial nations.

GREAT BRITAIN MAY HAVE TO STAY POOR

As far as the victors are concerned, there is Great Britain standing around with hat in hand, timidly, almost tremblingly—because England is afraid of the French aerial fleet.

That is the only reason why the British Labor Party quietly dropped the scrapping of the treaty of Versailles from its program when MacDonald became Prime Minister.

There are millions of unemployed in England. France, however, up to the present day is not willing to permit Europe to become peaceful again. France is still keeping an army in the Rhine Province, sucking the lifeblood of industrial Germany.

And although England is largely depending on German trade, England is helpless.

So much for Great Britain. Is America to underwrite and perpetuate this condition?

WHAT IS NOW THE GLORY OF FRANCE?

Then there is France, which apparently drew the grand prize of this war. The fact is that France is maintaining the greatest standing army ever known, and is supporting the most elaborate and most military apparatus in history—out of sheer cowardice—since Germany is completely disarmed. It keeps 50,000 men in the Rhine Province alone after leaving the Ruhr district. The Germans, however, must pay for these.

Not only is France maintaining its own costly military establishment, but she has loaned money to Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and to Czechoslovakia for the purpose of maintaining their armies and military establishments to assist French aggression whenever France so desires.

Is America to perpetuate this condition also?

DAWES PLAN MAKESHIFT OF INTERNATIONAL BANKERS TO EXPLOIT GERMANY

And then there is the Dawes plan. This is simply an attempt of the international bankers to enforce the impossible pact of Versailles.

France claims she can not pay her debts to the United States, but the bankrupt and starved German people are expected to pay some \$35,000,000,000, which the Allies demand to begin with, because they have not set the total sum as yet, and this is more than thirty times as much as victorious Germany demanded of France in 1871.

Neither does the Dawes plan fix the total amount Germany is to pay. It only decides the amount Germany must pay each year for the next five years. The Dawes Commission does not say whether Germany is to pay that tribute for 100 years or for 1,000.

Furthermore, the plan provides that Germany must pay most of her reparations in goods, since the Allies have taken all the gold Germany possessed.

Thus the great problem is, How much goods can France and Belgium and England absorb without putting their own people out of work?

The Dawes plan worked for the first two years, because under the pretext of the plan Germany could borrow money from American bankers to fulfill her obligations during the first two years.

But for how long can Germany go on borrowing money for that purpose?

Only one-half of what the Germans are to pay is raised by taxation. The rest is a mortgage on the railroads and on all the private establishments, factories, mines, shops, etc., in Germany. These the French can sell to the highest bidder—to the capitalists of their own country, or to J. Pierpont Morgan, or to anyone else any time the Germans fall behind. The French Army is ready and Germany is defenseless. France asks for no declaration from the "accredited spokesman of America."

Evidently French and American plutocrats are looking for some pretext to get hold of all the railroads, factories, and mines of Germany. The Dawes Commission may furnish the pretext.

And, on top of it all, the Dawes plan does not set any date when Germany is supposed to have paid her debt.

HOPE THAT SOMETHING WILL HAPPEN

Moreover, there is also the all-important question, How long will the German people be willing to work like the slaves in Egypt or the slaves in old Rome for their foreign masters?

There is only this difference. That the German slaves are permitted to stay in their own country. According to the Dawes plan, they may have to remain in slavery forever.

All of which proves the Dawes plan the most devilish plan of squeezing and stripping a nation ever concocted in the history of the world.

The German Government and German Reichstag accepted this plan. They did so only under compulsion, because the nation was starving and the French bayonets were at the people's throats. It was only accepted with the hope that something would happen in the future that would show Germany the way out. Is the "accredited spokesman" of America to tell the Germans now that they are to remain Helots forever?

This hope "that something would happen in the future" is evidently also in the minds of the best English statesmen. They see no way of being able to coerce France, which, if it so desired, could lay waste to London, Liverpool, Manchester, and any other English city within three days, as French papers gleefully point out. France possesses to-day the largest and best-equipped aerial fleet in the world.

A WORLD REVOLUTION MAY BE THE OUTCOME

On the other hand, all sensible men, and especially sensible Englishmen, must be aware that if they permit French and American capitalists to enslave 80,000,000 human beings—white human beings and highly intelligent and efficient human beings—in that manner, this would be the first step for enslaving the working class of England and even of France within a short time. A most terrific and bloody revolution, such as the world has never seen before, would sooner or later follow. And this may bring about bolshevism or wipe out the white race in Europe.

Now, this is an appalling situation. It is a danger which is not only facing Europe, of which Germany is a vital part, but our entire civilization.

GERMANY HAD NO CHOICE

And to return to the treaty of Versailles. It is based entirely on the "sole war guilt" of Germany.

The 14 points on which Germany laid down her arms were not even mentioned in Paris when the peace treaty was framed.

Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes, who studied the question of the Versailles treaty and of fixing the guilt of starting the war, says:

"Germany occupied the situation of a prisoner at the bar. And it was a case where the prosecution simply contented itself with the assumption of the guilt of the defendant. It was not required to furnish the proof. Germany was confronted with the alternative of signing the confession at once or having her territory invaded and occupied, with every probability that such an admission would ultimately be extorted from her."

LIE ABOUT GERMAN WAR GUILT GREATEST LIE OF ALL

It is generally admitted to-day, however, by all those who read the documents pertaining to the origin of the war, that the worst of all the innumerable war lies is the horrible lie that Germany was the sole cause of the World War. The pact of Versailles rests upon it.

The disclosures of the secret archives, which were published by the soviets, supplemented later by those from the German and English foreign offices, prove that Germany, instead of having been more guilty than the other powers in starting the World War, was infinitely less guilty than any of them.

In America we were told, however, that Germany, the "mad dog of Europe," had prepared for 44 years to fall upon the entirely unprepared civilized world in order to chew it up.

We entered the war because babies' fingers were cut off in Belgium by the Huns. We Americans went to war to "abolish militarism in the world forever."

But now we are to have our reward!

AMERICA IS TO HELP "TO DETER AN AGGRESSOR"

Now comes Mr. Steed, formerly editor of the London Times and at present editor of the Review of Reviews in London, and says:

"It's a fundamental truth that without the moral support of the United States there can be no certainty of world peace. Should there ever be a 'next war'—which God forbid, for it would probably mean the bolshevization of Europe—it is inconceivable that one side or the other could triumph without the moral backing of America.

"Englishmen used to say 'my country, right or wrong.' They say it no longer—or, at least, a strong and influential body of them understand that for Great Britain to pursue any policy likely to lead to war, or to attempt to use war or the weapon of blockade for the formation of any specific interest, would be to forfeit her title to the respect of mankind and to court the destruction of the British commonwealth of nations. * * *

"Modern Englishmen ask themselves and would fain ask the American people whether at some future time, after due deliberation and uninfluenced by any save purely American considerations, the accredited spokesman of the American people could not declare that the United States abhors aggressive war and that it will never weaken the hands of other nations which may band themselves together for the purpose of deterring an aggressor or compelling him to desist from aggression."

Mr. Steed remembers that when the British Government in 1920 wanted to send troops to help Poland fight Russia the British trade unions declared categorically that they would stop every wheel in England on 24-hours notice.

"LET GEORGE DO IT"

Evidently this is the strong and influential element in Great Britain now that would not go to war, "right or wrong," for their country. These workers want to be shown.

And since, as he explains at the beginning of his article, the League of Nations is failing to secure the peace of the world, in spite of the Locarno agreements, because neither Great Britain nor France, nor any other of the great military or naval powers, seem to be willing to diminish its armaments; and since it is clear that Germany can not remain permanently disarmed in the midst of armed neighbors unless the Germans agree to be the slaves of their neighbors forever; therefore Mr. Steed is willing to let "George do it." And not George V.

(Coburg) but the successor of George Washington in the District of Columbia is to do it—in case that members of the League of Nations should take joint action against an "aggressive nation."

BRITISH DIPLOMATS WOULD ALWAYS SHOW US THE ENEMY

In other words, Mr. Steed proposes that the United States, which by a referendum of the people has refused to join the League of Nations, should underwrite the league and its decisions by a declaration of "the accredited spokesman."

No "accredited spokesman" has a right to make such a declaration. That is fortunate—otherwise we would soon have a chance to repeat our recent experience. We would soon get a chance to fight some "mad dog of Europe" or Asia. We would fight many more "wars to end all wars." The British Tories would always be willing to show us the enemy.

PROFITS NOT IDEALS GOT US INTO THE WAR

Nevertheless, we are told by Mr. Steed that our "idealism" is not quite fully appreciated in Europe, even at the present time. There are still many ingrates in France and England who believe that we went to war because our munition makers and food speculators, who had profited to the tune of \$7,000,000,000, wanted still more profits. There are some even in America who say that the fiscal agents of the Allies, Morgan & Co., had about a billion and a half coming from the allied governments, which indebtedness was a poor asset, in spite of all the innumerable victories they had won in the American papers every day, until the United States got into the scrap.

The truth is that no "idealism" got us into the World War. It was an incredible war propaganda—propaganda which probably was more thorough in America than in any country on God's earth. Parliament was told that the British Government spent about \$500,000,000 during the war for that purpose, with the explanation that this was the best investment England had made. It was.

THE WAR PROPAGANDA IN AMERICA

More money was spent for propaganda in our country than in any other, and for a much longer period, but that was hardly necessary. The same plutocracy interested in getting the country into the war also controls most of the newspapers and controls the schools, churches, theaters, cinemas, and all means of communication and publicity.

Idealism? All that these propaganda agencies—including the myriads of four-minute speakers—accomplished was to awaken a certain mob spirit ready to murder and lynch. That spirit still prevails.

Of course, some young men volunteered—not very many—for what they called patriotic reasons.

In a sort of a hazy way they believed they were defending their country and their homes, lest "the Kaiser would come over and take all our money away."

MOST OF THEM ARE NOW DERAMBOOZLED

But that kind of a story could not be repeated in our country for a generation to come—not even in order to enforce a decision of the League of Nations.

These young men are so disillusioned now that they would not even fight to keep up the Polish corridor through Germany or to hold the Tyrol for Italy, although the League of Nations is guaranteeing these and many other things. In fact, most of our soldiers realize to-day that they have been "bamboozled" much worse than "that old Presbyterian" in the White House.

A proclamation such as Mr. Steed suggests would raise a tremendous outcry against that President and his party about meddling again in Europe.

LET EUROPE UNITE ON ECONOMIC LINES

If Europe wants to have peace, Europe must scrap the pact of Versailles and get together on reasonable political and economic lines. The best method would be the formation of a United States of Europe, framed after the pattern of Switzerland, where Germans, Frenchmen, and Italians live together peaceably and happily.

Or if that can not be accomplished as yet, let them unite in two or three large economic units. These could get together again on many international, political, and economic questions.

That's the only solution. A "world Monroe doctrine" would not only add to our troubles but also to the troubles of Europe. Just ask Mexico or Nicaragua.

FOOD, RAW MATERIAL, AND TRADE ARE MAIN CAUSES

And now as to the other reason, the probability of difficulties with Great Britain.

The causes of modern war, and especially also of the World War, are clear to any observer. Most countries of Europe are limited territorially and are densely populated. The food that can be raised is insufficient to support the large population, and the natural resources can not supply the requirements of the industries. This is obviously the case in Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Belgium, and some other countries.

From this condition rises the rivalry for acquisition of foreign colonies, the efforts to defend and extend the oversea possessions and the policies of militarism and navalism. For many centuries sea power meant world power.

NATIONALISTIC HATREDS AND PAST HISTORIES ARE THE OTHER CAUSES

Add to this the memories of previous wars. There were 23 wars between France and Germany in 300 years. The French invaded Germany nineteen times and the Teutons retaliated four times. Add also the national hatreds and the thoughts of revenge—the policies of the "balance of power" in Europe, which was Great Britain's aim for centuries—the secret intrigues of diplomats—the fears and suspicions and megalomanias bred and fed and spread by the vicious nationalistic press in all nations—Pan Slavism, Pan Germanism, Pan Gallicism, and Britannia that must rule the waves—and the powerful armament and munition interests that reap rich harvests out of war—and there we have the sinister background.

No American declaration could make any change in these historical factors.

CAPITALIST SYSTEM INEVITABLY BREEDS IMPERIALISM

But deep at the bottom of modern struggles lie even more fundamental causes—causes rooted in the very nature of capitalist production.

Under the present system the wages received by the workers of any industrialized nation are insufficient to enable them to buy back with their wages what they have produced. The employing class makes a profit on their labor—and must make a profit in order to carry on business. Thus a surplus of products accumulates. The capitalist class, being small in number, can not consume all of the surplus. This surplus must be exported to foreign markets.

Moreover, in every industrialized nation—which to-day means every western civilized nation—it becomes increasingly difficult for the capitalists to reinvest their accumulated profits to advantage in their own country. These capitalists are constantly forced to look for new fields of profitable investment.

Thus capitalism inevitably leads to imperialism. This in turn brings about vast armaments and big navies. And sooner or later it brings war—not only to subjugate backward nations but also to destroy competitors.

Great Britain has been, so far, very successful in destroying competitors for the world market. Great Britain has annihilated the sea power of Spain, France, Holland, and Germany. Who is to be next?

MUSSOLINI MAY ALSO TRY IT

Of course, reactionary governments sometimes also deliberately plunge countries into war for the purpose of crushing progressive movements by creating "patriotic" excitement. This was evidently the case in Russia, for instance, where the Czar used the issue of Pan Slavism—or the world rule of the Slavic race—in an effort to hold down the Russian revolutionists. That is the reason why the "little white father" was so willing to make the plunge. Mussolini may try a similar stunt.

By the way, the only good that resulted from the World War was the dethronement of the Hohenzollerns, Hapsburgs, and Romanoffs—although all of this might have been brought about without a world cataclysm.

SOCIALISTS PREDICTED COMING OF WORLD WAR

At any rate, for more than half a century before the World War socialist writers and speakers warned the world of the impending tragedy, but the warning went unheeded. It is even possible that the capitalist world, constituted as it is, could not heed the warning without undergoing a thorough change, which capitalism fears.

Thus the World War came in spite of the warnings and protests of the socialists, and in spite of the personal desires of many of the capitalists themselves.

AMERICA NOW GREAT BRITAIN'S COMPETITOR

But the same elements and forces are still at work. Germany is crushed. But business is business still. Germany's place in world politics and also in the world markets is rapidly being taken by the United States of America. We are now Great Britain's most powerful competitor.

The statistics issued by our Department of Commerce tell a vivid story.

If the people shall remain blind to the terrible lessons of the World War and continue as they did with war pacts, secret alliances, declarations by "accredited spokesmen," leagues of nations, balances of power, etc., we may have a repetition of the disaster. In other words, if the main causes that brought on the World War—the causes that brought England into the World War—are left to operate, then this World War was surely not the last war.

Then it was only the first of a series of wars, each of them more terrible, more tragic than the one before. And the result may not even be bolshevism, it may be the wiping out of the white civilization and possibly of the white race.

THE NEXT "MAD DOG" WILL PROBABLY CHEW UP THE BRITISH EMPIRE

If England should determine to uphold its rule of the seven seas and its final control of the world's markets—as the Tories want England to do—by insisting on keeping up a larger navy than any other country, then, undoubtedly, England may also fight. And it will get its

allies wherever it can; even in Asia. But most certainly England will not be able to "Copenhagen" its next adversary. The next "mad dog" will probably chew up the British Empire.

And so long as these causes continue to operate any underwriting by the United States of any of these leagues or alliances can help nothing. Any declaration may simply furnish additional pretexts.

And that is absolutely unnecessary, because there always will be pretexts aplenty for a war when one is wanted. And as inventions and science are put to the service of militarism the wars will become more horrible.

SOCIALIST PARTIES A BLESSING

Socialism would have no such problems, of course. And even socialistic governments under the present form of society could readily find a solution. This is one of the reasons why even a big socialist party is a blessing to any civilized country, and would be a blessing to America.

I understand, however, that we can not abolish capitalism overnight. Any such attempt would only bring more misery.

And we do not have a Socialist Party commensurate with the size and importance of the country in the United States to-day, although there are such parties in Great Britain, Germany, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries.

MY PROPOSITION

Therefore this is my proposition:

Scrap the pact of Versailles and all the other pacts dictated by war, hatred, and hell.

Let the representatives of all the civilized nations of the world be assembled in a great world conference for the purpose of undoing, as far as possible, the evil effects of the World War and prevent its repetition.

WIPE SLATE CLEAN OF ALL DEBTS AND INDEMNITIES

Let us wipe the slate clean of all the war debts and indemnities. Germany by this time has paid about one hundred times as much as she should have paid. The reparation claim is a barefaced fraud. Allied cannons did as much damage as did German guns.

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR MINORITIES

Have referendums in all the various countries where there are strong minorities—under the rule of foreign governments. Let such people themselves decide whether they want to stay under that foreign rule. Give them their independence if demanded by two-thirds of the inhabitants of any contiguous district that borders on a nationality of their own.

ABOLISH ECONOMIC BARRIERS

Wipe out the economic obstacles, border lines, and tariffs all over Europe. America is a continent and a world of its own. Have absolute free exchange of production in Europe. Take in Russia also, if Russia is willing to come. If America troubles Europe by an eccentric high tariff, let a united Europe put up the same kind of a tariff against America. We are bright and will soon learn.

AN INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AND AN INTERNATIONAL COURT

Have an international congress, with certain well understood legislative powers over international affairs. And establish a genuine international court to construe these international laws. America ought to join in that.

USE ONLY ECONOMIC PRESSURE TO ENFORCE DECISIONS

Appoint special commissions of neutrals to consider international disputes as they may arise. Such decisions to be enforced, if necessary, by economic pressure without resort to arms.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF STRATEGIC WATERWAYS

Have international control of strategic waterways, such as the Dardanelles, the Straits of Gibraltar, and also the Suez, Kiel, and Panama Canals.

ASSURE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Have absolute neutrality and freedom of the seven seas. Divide up the colonies among the great European nations. We do not need any. In order to make all of this possible there must be as complete and universal a disarmament as necessary. And it ought to be brought about as speedily as possible.

PROHIBIT EXPORTATION OF WAR MATERIALS

And by all means let us have absolute prohibition of exportation of arms, war equipment, and food supplies for war purposes from one country to another.

Some of these propositions may look Utopian. But they are not. All of them are practicable.

If these steps are taken there can be no doubt that wars will be a thing of the past, at least within the white race.

As a primary measure, however, as the "conditio sine qua non"—the pact of Versailles must be scrapped. Otherwise "the next war," which God forbid, will mean the bolshevization of Europe.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purpose of interpreting the meaning of the tariff act of 1922 with respect to imported broken rice, "broken rice" shall include only rice which falls within the class "Brewers' milled rice," as defined in the United States standards for milled rice as promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SIMMONS members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9136) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of \$113,000 is hereby appropriated out of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, the sum of \$48,000 of said amount for the benefit of the Ute Mountain (formerly Navajo Springs) Band of said Indians in Colorado, and the sum of \$35,000 of said amount for the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, and the sum of \$30,000 of said amount for the Southern Ute Indians in Colorado, which sums shall be charged to said bands, and the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the accrued interest to and including June 30, 1928, on the funds of the said Confederated Bands of Ute Indians appropriated under the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 934), and to expend or distribute the same for the purpose of administering the property of and promoting self-support among the said Indians, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress, on the first Monday in December, 1929, a detailed statement as to all moneys expended as provided for herein: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this paragraph shall be expended on road construction unless, wherever practicable, preference shall be given to Indians in the employment of labor on all roads constructed from the sums herein appropriated from the funds of the Confederated Bands of Utes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 23, after the word "prescribe," strike out the language down to and including the word "herein," on line 2, page 66.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, that simply strikes out the requirement for a report of expenditures. They are reported in the Budget, and another report does not seem to be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, since I am on my feet I ask unanimous consent to return to page 17, line 23, in order to make a correction. The appropriation for the year 1928 is referred to and it should be 1927.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the request? I could not hear.

Mr. CRAMTON. In the draft of the bill the appropriation for 1928 is referred to and it should be 1927.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 23, strike out "1928" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1927."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boise project, Idaho: For continuation of construction, Payette and Arrowrock divisions, \$400,000: *Provided*, That of the unexpended bal-

ance of the appropriation for this project for the fiscal year 1927 there is reappropriated for operation and maintenance, Payette division, \$17,000; for investigations, examination and surveys, Payette division, \$18,000; for continuation of construction, Arrowrock and Payette divisions, \$75,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct the text, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 76, line 8, after the word "Payette," strike out "and Arrowrock divisions" and insert in lieu thereof the word "division."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Riverton project, Wyoming: For operation and maintenance, \$30,000; continuation of construction under force account, \$400,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1928, which is hereby reappropriated: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 from the power revenues shall be available during the fiscal year 1929 for the operation and maintenance of the commercial system; in all, \$430,000.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question with reference to a paragraph on page 80 concerning the Riverton project in Wyoming. I note that the amount is reduced about one-half from that which was reported by the Budget, and I would be pleased to have a word from the chairman with reference to that reduction, and whether it might reasonably be expected to be carried in the next bill, inasmuch as it is not included in this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, possibly a word about the Riverton project would be of interest. That is an important project and involves altogether a large expenditure. Some time ago what was known as the pavilion division was constructed. Settlement of that division has been slow and unsatisfactory. Then construction was commenced on the pilot division, principally the pilot canal, opening lands nearer the railroad. Congress made a large appropriation for that work. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation went on the project some two or three years ago in the course of that work, and the Secretary of the Interior was so unfavorably impressed that he ordered the work stopped. Since that time construction of the project further has been a matter of some controversy here. Last year the department reversed its attitude and recommended that the construction of the Pilot Division be resumed, and the Budget recommended, in the deficiency appropriation bill that failed last year, an item of something like \$500,000.

The majority of this subcommittee went over the project late in September and made some study for two days of its problems, and were more favorably impressed by its possibilities than we had been before. We were impressed, certainly, with the fact that the portion of the project already constructed can not be expected to develop without the further construction of the pilot division. While we were there we were assured that construction of the project beyond the pilot division would not be desired or asked for until there was a reasonable settlement of the pavilion and pilot divisions. Furthermore, we initiated negotiations while we were there which resulted, through the activity of our colleague, Mr. WINTER, and the governor of the State, Governor Emerson, in assurances of the construction of a branch of the railroad into this project as soon as our development becomes an actuality. Also, we have assurances from the beet-sugar companies of the construction of a beet-sugar factory to serve this district, following the development that may be anticipated.

For all of these reasons the committee was satisfied that the work should continue and the pilot division be constructed. That pilot division construction is to cost approximately \$1,000,000, or just a trifle more than that. The deficiency item that was submitted in the deficiency bill last year, which failed, was submitted again by the Budget in the deficiency bill that just went through, and by the deficiency appropriation subcommittee was referred to our subcommittee, so that we had before us the two Budget estimates, each for approximately a half million dollars, a total of something over a million dollars for construction of these projects. These items for construction are immediately available. The information that we have on the ground, and since, all goes to the effect that something like a half million dollars is all that can be economically expended in one construction season. Therefore there seems no compelling reason, no substantial reason, for giving an ap-

propriation for a million dollars. The project will be just as well off. Its construction will advance just as rapidly if the further appropriation is given a year from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask recognition in my own right. I can understand, with the experience which they have had and the disappointment which they suffered before when construction was under way and was suspended, that the people there may well view the future with some uncertainty. I think, however, they may rest entirely satisfied with what we here report. This bill gives a cash appropriation of \$400,000 and a reappropriation of \$177,000 from the old unexpended balance, and an appropriation of power revenues.

It will give them for construction of the pilot canal something over \$500,000, something more than the Budget estimate that was in our bill. Inasmuch as the department after further investigation has, for two successive years, recommended the completion of the construction of the pilot canal, and inasmuch as the Budget has for two successive years recommended it, and inasmuch as our committee after examination on the ground recommends this appropriation, and the report of the Committee on Appropriations indicates that a similar appropriation may be expected to follow it the next year, as the committee report says—

It is to be expected that a similar appropriation will be made in the 1930 bill, permitting completion of the pilot canal in the calendar year 1929—

the people in that vicinity may well feel satisfied as to what may be expected for next year. While the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. WINTER] knows that I can not vouch for the action of Congress any more than he can, if as much, yet I can say that my own personal opinion is that there is no question about the appropriation of the amount remaining being made a year from now, so that that work can be completed in the calendar year 1929.

Now, that is the action of Congress. What action may be taken by the Interior Department is, of course, another question. But I have no doubt but that since they have now studied the problem they will proceed with the work.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WINTER. I simply want to say that the explanation of the chairman is clear, and I think it has made manifest the disposition of himself and his subcommittee toward the final completion of this project. I thank the chairman for the statement he has made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations to be made by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation to obtain necessary information to determine how arid and semiarid, swamp, and cut-over timberlands in any of the States of the United States may be best developed, as authorized by subsection R, section 4, second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, approved December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 704), including the general objects of expenditure enumerated and permitted in the fourth paragraph in this act under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," and including mileage for motor cycles and automobiles at the rates and under the conditions authorized herein in connection with the reclamation projects, \$15,000.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I do so for the purpose of getting some information. Last year, when this bill was up for consideration, I moved to strike out \$15,000 and make it \$50,000, because I was assured by the department that it would take \$50,000 to complete the work. At the beginning of this session, to my surprise, this \$50,000 was not included in the deficiency bill. I took the matter up with the department, and my understanding was that the subcommittee would place it in the bill and that the amount would be \$50,000 for this work when the bill came before us. I now find that \$15,000 is recommended for the reclamation and investigation of arid and semiarid and swamp and cut-over timberland for every State in the Union as sufficient to complete that work. I have before me the statement of the chairman of this subcommittee which I would like to read, because the report says "any State in the Union." I doubt seriously if my friend from Michigan really meant this. He says:

Mr. CRAMTON. On page 365 there is an old item with reference to arid, semiarid, swamp, and cut-over timberlands in the South. At the time you anticipated that there would be in the deficiency bill a

further appropriation, but it was transferred to this bill, and I wish you would prepare a statement with reference to it. The item as submitted by the Budget for the deficiency bill reads:

"For investigations to be made by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation to obtain necessary information to determine how arid and semiarid, swamp, and cut-over timberlands in any of the States of the United States may be best developed, as authorized by subsection R, section 4, second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, approved December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. p. 704), including the general objects of expenditure enumerated and permitted under the second paragraph in this act under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation,' and including mileage for motor cycles and automobiles at the rates and under the conditions authorized herein in connection with the reclamation projects, \$50,000."

Please set forth clearly the progress that has been made, the theory on which the department has been working, what you have done, and what you plan to do next year. For instance, I wish you would give some expression to this consideration. I have had the theory ever since this particular work started that it was leading up to the expenditure of Federal funds for the development of swamp lands and cut-over timberlands in the South, and I have been inclined to oppose it because of that fact. In Michigan we are not going to ask the Federal Government to furnish money to develop cut-over lands, and I think that these other States can very well take care of their own projects along those lines. I notice from the papers that within the last few days there has been a meeting held by Representatives from the South, and that they are declaring for a policy of Federal financing of this program. A number of very distinguished Members of Congress from the South have assured me that that would not be the case. Now, if you have any information as to the policy on which this project is proceeding, whether it is going to be one for Federal financing, or whether it is simply for Federal guidance and cooperative investigation, to be financed locally, I would be glad to have it.

Mr. CRAMTON. The fact is that I referred to the expenditure of Federal funds for the development of swamp and cut-over lands, whether north or south, east or west.

Mr. SEARS OF FLORIDA. I understood the gentleman said "the South."

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not believe in any development in the States by the use of Federal funds for that purpose.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is not so reported in the hearings. On page 80 and page 81 of the bill is the item—

For investigation necessary to determine the economic conditions and financial feasibility of new projects and for investigations and other activities relating to the reorganization, settlement of lands, and final adjustments of existing projects, including examination of soils, classification of land, land-settlement activities—

and so forth, there is an appropriation of \$75,000. I did not oppose that. I think I have been big enough and broad enough since I have been a Member of Congress to support propositions of that kind regardless of any sections of the country. These propositions should stand on their own merit. If I felt that the \$75,000 would not be sufficient, I would move to increase that to \$100,000.

With the information now before me, I am frank to confess to the committee that the expenditure of only \$15,000 for any State in the Union would be practically wasted, and if you distributed it among the States of Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, it would be wasted. Last year I referred the matter to the department, and I am satisfied in a letter to me it is stated that practically nothing could be accomplished with a fund of \$15,000 except the compilation of data and information. I was assured such was true.

We have some of the richest lands in the world in my State, and that land should be investigated for the benefit of the people of Michigan and other States represented by members of the committee, and then they would know how to utilize that rich land. We know something of that ourselves. I hope some Member of this House will offer an amendment to make it \$50,000, because I believe Doctor Mead will not squander that money, and I am satisfied that when the bill goes to the Senate the Senate will increase the amount to \$50,000 if we do not. I am satisfied that the convention which is to meet on the 28th of this month, the great leaders of thought in the States, will indorse the increase of the amount to \$50,000. I would like to hear from some of my colleagues on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman's request for information, I may say that the work in question is quite different from the \$75,000 item referred to on page 81. This last item is for economic and other investigations confined almost entirely to projects where we now have millions of dollars invested and where we are trying to get the money back. The appropriation comes out of the reclamation fund chargeable

to these projects that will be investigated. The particular item now before us comes out of the Treasury of the United States.

In the course of an investigation leading up to a proposal to adopt a new policy that we have not heretofore carried on, that investigation has been under way for some time. It has progressed so far that on page 936 of the hearings you will find a resolution of a recent conference of these leaders of thought whom the gentleman mentions—the conference on southern reclamation by its committee on legislation; that they have reached the point in their investigation where they have figured out how much money they want to ask Congress for.

The investigation of the work, so far as the expenditure of Federal funds is concerned, has been carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation, in the Department of the Interior, and when Doctor Mead was before the subcommittee a memorandum which is inserted at the top of page 936 of the hearings states that—

In North Carolina, Florida, and Alabama these investigations have not been completed. The appropriation of \$15,000 requested will be sufficient to accomplish this result and complete a final report on the work in all seven States. No further appropriations for investigations of this character seem to be necessary unless some constructive action is decided upon and legislation fixing the extent of the Federal Government's participation is enacted by Congress.

When I read that, I was not entirely sure that the doctor and I fully understood the situation. I was not sure that he was aware of the item for \$50,000, because he spoke of \$15,000; so I wrote him, and as a result I received a letter from him of date December 28, 1927, in which he says:

The \$50,000 item for further investigation, to which you refer in the second paragraph of your letter, may be omitted. The item of \$15,000, which I believe is at present in the appropriation bill as it is before your committee, however, will be necessary to close up the investigations we have in progress, particularly in Florida, North Carolina, and Alabama, and then prepare the report for transmission to Congress. I trust this item of \$15,000 will be left intact.

Of course, he was laboring under a slight misunderstanding. There was only one item before us, and that was the item of \$50,000. There was no item of \$15,000. So we cut the \$50,000 to \$15,000 and gave him all we understand he needs, and I think that is all the gentleman can expect us to do.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Whose statement is that?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is the statement of Doctor Mead, the Commissioner of Reclamation.

Mr. EDWARDS. And he states that \$15,000 is all that is necessary until the work is actually authorized by law.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is it exactly, and we are guided entirely by that statement.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. That is to carry on the work now in hand, which is a mere casual investigation. I am not betraying any confidence when I tell you they want more than \$15,000, but they were afraid they will not even get the \$15,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure Doctor Mead was not suffering from such a difficulty.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. He would like to carry on a further examination if the newspaper reports are correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. I put the matter fully before him and asked him whether he needed the full \$50,000 or whether he could do without the \$50,000.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. He said he would not object if I could have the amount increased here.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I understand that the chairman contends \$15,000 will be sufficient for the investigation until a constructive policy is determined upon.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the statement of the Commissioner of Reclamation.

Mr. HARE. I would like to know whether the committee has made any plans for a definite future constructive policy for reclamation.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is not within the jurisdiction of my committee. That is a legislative proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "\$15,000," in line 11, page 83, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBY: Page 83, line 11, strike out "\$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000."

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, it seems that this particular item for investigations to be made by the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to obtain necessary information to determine how arid, swamp, and cut-over lands may be developed has been pretty well discussed by the chairman of the subcommittee, by my colleague from Florida [Mr. SEARS], and others. I happen to recall the very strong sentiment that was expressed by the department that is handling this proposition on the occasion of the getting together of the reclamation advocates last year, the occasion which has been referred to. At that time all were of the opinion that the \$50,000 which was being provided for in the deficiency appropriation bill was as little as we ought to have for that work.

There is a turn of affairs in the southern section of our country which makes it imperative that we give some attention to the development of that section as well as to taking in the arid lands in the western part of the United States. I am sure every one is familiar with the reclamation fund that has been used for a great many years in the Western States, and used freely by them because it was set apart for them. The chairman of the committee now tells us we are using \$75,000 out of the Treasury for the purpose of investigating conditions surrounding those projects so that we may protect the money that has gone out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand me, and I am not sure whether he does or not. The \$75,000 comes out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. BUSBY. Well, it is a matter of bookkeeping as to which one of the items you would place it in.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is the gentleman familiar with the manner in which the reclamation fund is created?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes; I know that exactly.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is not created out of funds from the Treasury but is created mostly from the sale of public lands and oil leases in the West.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not created entirely from the sale of public lands in the West. Alabama has contributed to that fund, and I believe the State of Texas and a great many other States.

Mr. LEAVITT. But the bulk of it comes from the Western States.

Mr. BUSBY. The fund is made up of moneys derived from the sale of public lands and public properties, the proceeds of which go into this reclamation fund.

Mr. ARENTZ. Most of the money comes from oil leases.

Mr. LEAVITT. The sums received from sources other than western oil leases and the sale of public lands are very small and almost immaterial. Of course, I do not say that in opposition to the gentleman's position.

Mr. BUSBY. I am not in opposition to the great work that is being done in the West, but the proposition I want to present here is the necessity for an increase in this amount if we are to carry out the original program outlined by Doctor Mead and according to his own statements and his own words last year. Now, undoubtedly the department has altered its attitude on this proposition, but I believe an increase in this amount is necessary and should be provided in order to properly carry forward this particular class of work. Everyone knows that the South has made very few calls on the Government and has rarely asked for consideration at the hands of the Government from a financial standpoint.

If I did not feel this proposition was absolutely a necessary proposition and a valuable one to the country, and would bring material returns for the amount of attention and investment placed in it, I would not stand before you and advocate the adoption of the amendment I am offering here to-day.

With the progress of the South and the attention the country is turning to the South, especially from the dairying standpoint, you can not understand just what that means by the simple statement, unless you can see the northern and eastern dairying interests coming into that section, and with this condition confronting us, I feel we should be at least reasonably lenient toward the development of this particular proposition, and the gathering of information along the lines provided for in this fund. For this reason I have offered the amendment and ask its adoption.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to express an intelligent opinion as to whether \$15,000 is enough or the amendment offered by the gentleman who has just spoken should be adopted.

It was my privilege during the holiday recess of the Congress to make a trip to Florida with a number of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, who went there in an official capacity to make an investigation of a proposed harbor improvement on the east coast in the vicinity of Fort Lauderdale and Hollywood Beach.

I am sure the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors were very favorably impressed with the situation as they saw it. Several days were devoted to looking over that territory, including some long trips, hundreds of miles, through the Everglades and up to and around Lake Okeechobee. My understanding is that if the harbor improvements shall be made, then provision will be made for connecting the harbor with the waters of this lake as they flow through the Everglades to the ocean. This will lead to a development of the Everglades, an area of approximately 4,000,000 acres, in portions of which there has already been wonderful development.

This was my first visit to Florida and what I saw there was a revelation to me, and little as I am able to estimate and form an intelligent opinion of the prospects of development, it seems to me the opinion is justified that with and as a result of the harbor project there will eventually, soon, I believe, be large growth and improvement, large industrial and agricultural development. We saw farms, great gardens, where vegetables were growing; we saw sugar plantations where sugar cane is grown, the most wonderful growth that any of us had ever seen, the ground being wonderfully fertile and analyses showing that the cane has a higher sugar content than any other cane grown in the world.

As to agriculture, everything there seems to lend itself to progress and development, and as the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this bill says that no more money should be spent for these investigations than is in this bill provided until some project is determined or some development decided upon by the Congress, my impression is there will be a substantial harbor improvement down there. If this harbor is constructed and maintained the canal between Lake Okeechobee and the ocean will be opened. There will be commerce passing through the Everglades between the lake and the ocean, and there will be industrial and agricultural development. Everything indicates that the country will lend itself to this development, and if there is to be early harbor construction, as I trust there will be—if this prospect of harbor improvement is such a project as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] speaks of—then it may be time now to make an increase of this appropriation.

I am simply giving the committee the benefit of what I saw on the occasion of my pleasant visit to Florida, wishing simply to express firmly the opinion that it is a section of country to which the Federal Government should direct its attention and do everything that can becomingly and consistently be done. If more money than this bill carries is needed, it ought to be forthcoming and generously supplied.

The CHAIRMAN [Mr. LEHLBACH]. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three additional minutes in which to answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for three additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. Does not the gentleman realize that the very class of investigation we are asking for here must precede any intelligent action by Congress on a plan or program for reclamation or carrying forward the great work that the gentleman refers to in that particular section?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors went to Florida only to look over the harbor proposition. I have said if that improvement is to be made, and when it is made, perhaps coincident with its construction, there may be a call for further investigation and further activities by our Government. There is abundant opportunity for it, and I trust that at the right time, I do not know whether it is now or not, suitable appropriations should be made.

Mr. BUSBY. Of course, the gentleman realizes that about six or seven Southern States must rely on this small amount of \$15,000 for further investigations. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he was only in one portion of Florida.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. If other conditions are like that throughout these Southern States, then does not the gentleman feel that more than \$15,000 should be provided with which to furnish us information regarding the situation, so that we can intelligently proceed with our legislation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I wished to speak only of what I saw and the impressions I gained from traveling hundreds of miles over the fine roads in the portion of Florida I was privileged to see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Alabama will permit, I ask unanimous consent that after 20 minutes of debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto that debate thereupon be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this question of reclamation as it affects the southern sections has been one that has interested me for a number of years. In the Sixty-sixth Congress I introduced a comprehensive bill involving a policy along these lines. The reason that I thought the provisions of that bill were justified was because of my study of the western reclamation problem. Congress has been very liberal to you gentlemen of the West on your schemes out there, for it has appropriated and spent, in effect, out of the public funds to date at least \$150,000,000 on western reclamation problems.

I have always believed that basically the whole proposition was unsound, because it did not provide that the Government should receive a reasonable amount of interest for the development of these resources. In addition to that a great many mistakes have been made in the selection of feasible sites which have proved disastrous to the Government and the occupants, as you all know.

Here you carry \$75,000 in this bill for new projects. That is the language of the bill—feasible new projects in the West.

Mr. CRAMTON. The greater part of it is in trying to figure out how we will get the money out of the projects we have already inaugurated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then you ought to change the language in the bill. If it is not for new projects the language ought to be changed, for that is what it says.

Here is the attitude of the Representatives from the South on this question. There are millions of acres of swamp and overflowed land much more feasible for reclamation than the arid lands in the West, and our position has been since I started the fight that as a matter of equity one section of the country—and it ought not to be a sectional question—should have the same right as the other. The problem is one of national scope and authority. That is the reason I introduced the bill and had extensive hearings on it. President Harding in a message said that justice and wisdom should recognize our claims in the South for reclamation.

You say that this does not come out of the Treasury. It is true that it comes out of the reclamation fund, but if it had not been provided with receipts from public lands which have been converted into this fund they would have gone into the Treasury of the United States.

I realize that under the statement of the Commissioner of Reclamation the chairman of the subcommittee is well fortified in his objection to increasing the appropriation. But I do say—and I did not expect to say anything on the subject—that we have in the South, and you gentlemen who have been there know it—ininitely more inviting fields for real reclamation, at an infinitely cheaper cost, than you have in many western propositions, and especially along the lines of new projects that you are going into. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the item under consideration is for the purpose of further investigations looking to a policy of national reclamation. As has been suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], to be justified as a national policy reclamation must be extended to apply to all portions of the country. I think this object is one that promotes national progress and national development.

NATIONAL RECLAMATION

The Federal Government did not embark upon a general policy of reclamation until 1902. Prior to that date irrigation had been carried on by the several States and by development companies.

It is estimated that under the policy inaugurated by the United States about 25 years ago some 2,000,000 acres of land in the West have been reclaimed. The appropriations aggregate approximately \$200,000,000 for the reclamation of arid

lands in the Western States, including the State of Texas. It is well to remember that only one-tenth of the land irrigated in the United States has been financed by the Federal Government.

This is not a new subject in the United States. Many Commonwealths owe their agricultural progress to the policy of reclamation. The State of Utah started such a policy more than 50 years ago. Something like 20,000,000 acres of land in the arid and semiarid regions of the United States have been reclaimed.

The Federal Government does not make a donation for reclamation. The Government lends the money for the construction of the project; and the cost of the project, without interest, is to be repaid by the settler. The item of interest is an important one. In order to obtain Federal legislation for reclamation it was at first insisted that some Federal interest must be involved. Originally the reclamation of public lands was provided for. However, Federal reclamation has been extended to private ownership, and many projects have been authorized where no public lands are involved.

It has been estimated that the item of interest consumes about 40 to 50 per cent of the cost of drainage improvements in the South. Reclamation in the South means drainage. If the Federal Government were to extend the same aid in promoting reclamation by drainage that it does in promoting reclamation by irrigation, it would save about 50 per cent of the cost of improvement.

In 1902 a revolving fund for reclamation was created from the sale of public lands after that date in the 16 arid and semiarid Western States. Subsequently, in 1907, the State of Texas was included in the reclamation program. There are no public lands in Texas, and it can not, therefore, now be said that reclamation only obtains in those States where public lands have been sold since the passage of the act.

Large areas of public lands have been sold in the States of the South as well as in the Western States since 1902. The idea was that in the West the proceeds of public lands sold would be utilized to reclaim and develop the remaining public lands in the Western States. It was argued that in 1850 the Government had donated swamp and overflow lands to the several States in an effort to promote the internal improvement of the country and to provide for the reclamation of swamp lands. The fact is, however, that the legislation donating the swamp and overflow lands was extended to all the States of the Union. Mississippi received about 3,288,418 acres, while Minnesota received 4,677,649 acres, Michigan 5,656,000 acres, California 2,188,547 acres, and Wisconsin 3,251,830 acres.

It is also the fact that upon the admission of the Western States larger areas of public lands were donated to them than were donated to the Southern States or to the other older States of the Union at the time of their admission.

Reclamation is, therefore, being promoted by appropriations from the Federal Treasury. It is interesting to recall that even in the arid and semiarid Western States drainage is an essential part of reclamation. If the water is permitted to remain on the lands without any system of drainage, large areas become useless. Reclamation in the West means applying water to the lands; it also means taking water off of the lands after it has served its purpose. So reclamation in the South means taking water off the lands so that they can be utilized for cultivation. I repeat that reclamation in the South is synonymous with drainage.

There is just as good reason as a matter of public welfare and under the Constitution of the United States for extending the policy of reclamation to other sections of the country as there was for inaugurating it for the benefit of the Western States.

Thus far reclamation has been confined to the West. In many instances appropriations should not have been made, and the improvement should not have been done. There have been mistakes. The policy ought not be entirely abandoned because of mistakes that have been made. Mistakes are made in all lines of human endeavor. The need for efficient reclamation, however, remains and must be recognized.

Reclamation is as old as recorded history. Egypt developed agriculture by irrigation from the Nile. Farming was made possible in Mesopotamia by irrigation from the Euphrates. Reclamation by irrigation is to-day practiced in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia.

RECLAMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SWAMP AND CUT-OVER LANDS IN THE SOUTH

Congress recognizes that reclamation should be national and accordingly for the fiscal year 1919 appropriated \$100,000 for the investigation of lands outside of the then existing reclama-

tion projects in other sections of the country. Valuable information covering every State in the Union was accumulated, particularly in the South.

In 1924 Congress authorized an appropriation of \$100,000 to obtain information as to how arid, semiarid, swamp, and cut-over land might best be developed. Appropriations of \$15,000 were made by each of the sessions of the Sixty-ninth Congress. These appropriations were utilized to good effect by Dr. Elwood Mead, the efficient Director of Reclamation.

There is a widespread movement throughout the South for the conservation of the soil and for the reclamation of abandoned farm lands, as well as for the reclamation of swamp and cut-over lands. From every standpoint and from every angle there is just as good reason for Federal aid in drainage of swamp lands as there is for irrigation of arid lands.

The Federal interest is just as valid in one case as in the other. As a matter of fact, swamp and cut-over land can be reclaimed in the South at very much less expense than water can be applied to arid lands in the West. We are not denying the right of Federal aid for efficient reclamation. However, the policy of reclamation must be extended to embrace the entire country or it must be restricted. In many parts of the North, reclamation means drainage; in other parts of the country, reclamation means the restoration of worn-out and depleted lands. It may be more profitable to reclaim much of the non-productive and depleted lands by growing timber thereon rather than by cultivation. Agriculture would be promoted by the cultivation of fertile lands and by utilizing the less fertile lands for growing timber in many instances. Reclamation means conserving areas that are already reclaimed, rather than extending and enlarging the cultivated areas. It would be more economical to aid the drainage districts of the South in caring for their indebtedness in constructing their drainage systems than it would be to encourage and assist in the development of other lands for cultivation. This is true in many cases and in many parts of the country.

PROBLEM OF INCREASING POPULATION

It is frequently said that other lands ought not to be brought into cultivation. We have had Federal reclamation for 25 years. There are about 1,242,750 acres on Government irrigation projects, and in 1925 they produced crops valued at \$96,100,000. The total number of acres farmed in the United States during that year aggregated 372,000,000, with crops valued at \$13,031,000,000. But a small percentage of the cultivated lands in the country is irrigated; only a small percentage is drained.

However, population is increasing at the rate of about 30,000,000 every 25 years. We can afford to ignore the warning of those who say there is danger of overproduction. We must look to the future as we provide for the present. It has been well said:

Our last frontier has disappeared. The country must live within itself, and it is the part of good husbandry to protect our capital investment and restore by artificial means that which has been lost because of the demands of immediate necessity.

AIDED AND DIRECTED SETTLEMENT

There has been a revolution in the fundamental principles underlying reclamation. An evolution in the policy is easily observed. In all sections of the country the underlying principles that must govern all successful reclamation is aided and directed settlement. We have the experience of 25 years to profit by. Our mistakes in reclamation will be too expensive if we do not profit by them. The Bureau of Reclamation is aware that some projects have failed. There is much criticism of the Federal reclamation policy. Some \$25,000,000 advanced by the Federal Government have been charged off. Reclamation has not been profitable in many cases. The Federal Treasury has lost, in many instances.

We have come to know that reclamation means building up a community as well as the construction of dams and reservoirs. The original idea of building dams and constructing canals is not enough. Turning water on dry land is not reclamation. We have come to know that the failure to recognize other important elements is responsible for the criticism directed against the general policy. The defect in the policy was not in the method of construction, but it was in the matter of settlement. The failure is attributable to the neglect of the human element. It takes men to build a community. Settlers must be given a chance; they must have credit. There must be a community life. Settlements can not be in isolated units, but must be in groups to secure social and economic advantages.

Markets must be studied and a definite program of crops adopted. Transportation must be considered. Above all, the method should be for ownership rather than for tenancy. The policy of reclamation must not be perverted to enable the land

speculator to use Government funds for his own profit. Reclamation must be for the public benefit. It must be utilized to make the country more attractive and rural life more desirable. It must be utilized for the Nation and not merely for one section of the country. Both the need and the justification are as important in one case as in the other.

NATIONAL, NOT SECTIONAL

Reclamation is a part of the internal improvement policy of the United States. It distributes production; it distributes population; it creates national wealth; it provides for transportation; it furnishes markets for factories; it makes business for railroads; and it contributes to the health and wealth of the community and the Nation.

The abandonment of farms is a menace confronting the American people to-day. There are fewer farms in Mississippi to-day than there were five years ago. It is primarily an agricultural State. One of the great problems confronting the Nation is to make the countryside more attractive. The pioneer days are past. The farmer will no longer endure the hardships of life on the frontier. Life in the towns and cities is too attractive; work in the factories is too remunerative.

But agriculture is the basic industry of the country, and the Nation for its own well-being must protect agriculture as a part of the general policy for the public welfare. The Government must promote country life in the United States. Cities may multiply, but the citizens must be clothed and fed. The population of the Nation is increasing and we must provide for a larger population with each succeeding year. The West is entitled to reclamation, so is the North and the East and the South.

The South is a particularly inviting field. Its advantages are numerous. We have greater rainfall, more fertile soil, and a longer growing season. The cost of drainage in the South is far less than the cost of irrigation in the West. In the South we are closer to the markets of the country. It is not necessary to transport the products of the South over the transcontinental railroads.

Then, too, the South is facing the dawn of a new day. The eyes of the Nation are turning toward the superior advantages and marvelous resources of the South. Cotton mills are being moved from New England to the Carolinas; factories are being moved from Massachusetts to Tennessee.

The people of the South are determined to cooperate in every way possible to promote the reclamation of the entire country and in formulating a broad policy for reclamation. If Federal aid is extended for bringing into cultivation more acres in the arid West, it must be extended to aid in draining the swamp lands of the South. Aided and directed settlement is proclaimed as the salvation of the South. It must be practiced in the reclamation of the West. The theory must be converted into practice. One policy ought not to be advanced for the South and another for the West. We stand for the policy. We do not want exceptions made in any case. We ask that the same relief be given all sections.

If California can point with pride to her colonization policy for rural development, North Carolina can point with equal pride to the more successful and interesting experiments in land settlements that have been conducted by such public-spirited men as Mr. Hugh McRae of that State.

The modern and better idea is that in reclamation and rural development the fundamental element is not necessarily the reclamation of more land, but the building of homes; not the construction of more improvements, but the establishment of communities with facilities for social, business, and intellectual life that are attractive to worth-while citizens.

The South is ready to cooperate with the other States of the Union in promoting a national policy and a national program of reclamation. Without such a program reclamation can not succeed. The successful policy can not be sectional; it must be national.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope that the amendment offered by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY] will prevail. My mind goes back to the meeting about a year ago of those who were interested in reclamation work. They came here from all over the southeastern section of our country. Their expenses to Washington probably meant a great deal more than the small amount of money obtained. But it showed the willingness on their part to present the question to the Congress of the United States and to the country showing what they were interested in and willing to do on their part. It seems to me that the appropriation requested here of \$50,000 when you spread it over seven or eight States is a very modest request.

The Nation is looking toward the South for its future field of fortune, expansion, business development, and industrial and

economic evolution; all eyes are turned on the South, and on Florida in particular. This vast area of fertile and profitable land can and will be soon profitably utilized and developed.

Fifteen thousand dollars is about \$2,000 a State, yet we vote millions of dollars here for dams and other projects, which all mean for the development of our Nation. I vote for any section of my country that needs relief. When you want the arid lands reclaimed, I am willing to vote for it if the request is reasonable. Our Nation is well only when all sections of it are prosperous, happy, and are well cared for.

I appreciate the statement just made by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] when he told about his recent Florida trip, and of the great advantages and possibilities of Florida. Florida has already expended some \$11,000,000 in the reclamation of the Everglades. We have millions of acres of cut-over lands in the South on which we need scientific advice with respect to their development, and the whole Nation as well as the South needs this section reclaimed and developed. Probably Doctor Mead needed the \$50,000, but perhaps he wanted more for some other cause and feared he would jeopardize his causes if \$50,000 was asked for the South. The South and the Nation would benefit by the additional appropriation, and I hope the amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I trust I shall not be misunderstood by not offering the amendment. I simply want to get some information, and I want to repeat that if we appropriate only \$15,000 you will not be able to scratch the soil in Florida with an investigation, much less any of the other States. If you want to waste that amount, go ahead and do it. I say to you as a Representative in Congress that the department is anxious to increase this sum. I want to thank my good friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] for the nice things that he said about our State, and in reply will state that we already have a harbor of 25 feet at Miami. The members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors are familiar with that, and we are going to have some other harbors. I now have before the committee two surveys for cross-State canals that will go through that rich section.

I sincerely trust that this House will not play with the proposition, but will give the department enough money so that a real investigation may be made, and that your friends who desire to purchase down there, if any so desire, will have real information and not fictitious or false or partial information, as they have had in the past. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman has read the hearings. Doctor Mead, in charge of this work, came before the subcommittee and said that this is all the money that we need. The subcommittee allowed him this sum of \$15,000. Does the gentleman think it is fair to the committee, when no one appeared before the committee, to attempt to justify this increase now, when the head of the Reclamation Service says that \$15,000 is all that is needed? In fairness to the Subcommittee on Appropriations and to the full Committee on Appropriations, if more money is needed for this particular work, ought not you gentlemen who are now speaking in favor of this amendment to appear before the Committee on Appropriations and give it an opportunity to hear what you have to say in justification of your proposed amendment?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Did not Doctor Mead make so many other requests that he had to be modest in this work?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take a minute or two to complete what I have to say. We have here 1,196 pages of hearings.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I gave the gentleman two minutes of my time in which to fight this thing and I did it to save time. The gentleman asks why we did not come before the subcommittee. I will answer that by saying that we did not because we never dreamed it would be cut down.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman thinks there is pressing need for an increase in this appropriation, in fairness to the regular procedure of the House, does not the gentleman think that when the bill goes to the Senate he ought to go before the Committee on Appropriations and seek there to thoroughly justify this proposed amendment so that the matter may be fairly considered and not come here on the floor of the House, when there has been no consideration given to this extra amount by the committee, and ask that this be done at this time? The gentleman knows that we have been trying to assure everyone that there shall not be any logrolling and that every item in

this bill has had a fair consideration. I am sure that no man will criticize any member of the subcommittee when he reads these hearings and finds that Doctor Mead has said that \$15,000 is all that he wants.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. When my friend gets to the Senate, I shall go to him, but until that time I shall not follow such tactics as he suggests.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee does not know any politics or any section of the country. All sections are treated alike on their merits, and both sides of the aisle are treated alike. That is that.

There has been an investigation under way for two or three years leading up to some definite program of development of those swamp lands in the South, and they have come to the point where they have adopted resolutions as to what they want, and a bill has been introduced providing that money shall be taken out of the Treasury to improve those swamp lands. That investigation has been under the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, and he said to our committee that he did not need more than \$15,000, and he did not think more than that should be expended until Congress had provided a definite program by legislation.

The wisdom of that program which is proposed is not involved now. The only question involved now is whether, when the head of a responsible bureau who has been carrying the work along says to the Committee on Appropriations that \$15,000 is all he needs, we shall thrust upon him \$50,000. That is the only question that is involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Busby) there were—ayes 32, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations herein made shall be available for payment of the costs of packing, crating, and transportation (including drayage) of personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior;

Total, United States Geological Survey, \$1,758,080.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEAVITT. In the debate a few moments ago a statement was made in regard to the sources of the reclamation fund. I said that practically all of the fund was derived from the western public-land States. Since that time I have been able to secure the figures. Since the passage of the act of June 17, 1902, the reclamation act, there has been paid into the reclamation fund from oil leases, the sale of public lands, mineral leases, and to a small extent from the water power act, about \$140,000,000. Of that amount, Alabama had contributed \$46,000 and Louisiana about \$10,000, practically all from coal leases. That is all that has been paid into the reclamation fund from any States in the Union except the public-land States of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$2,100 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$113,460; for construction of physical improvements, \$55,540, including not exceeding \$45,700 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$1,700 shall be available for a checking station, \$18,000 for an administration building, and \$20,000 for a hospital building and equipment; in all, \$169,000. The amount of \$1,800 for the construction of a caretaker's cabin at sewage-purification plant, appropriated for the current fiscal year, is made immediately available for the construction of such employee's cottage in the Grand Canyon village site.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEMPLE: Page 90, line 10, after the word "site" at the end of the line, insert the following: "Funds herein appropriated shall be available for the maintenance of a road within the following-described area, which is hereby added to and made a part of the Grand Canyon National Park: Beginning at the corner common to sections 14, 15, 22, and 23, township 30 north, range 4 east, Gila and Salt River meridian; thence west along the section line between sections 15 and 22, a distance of 950 feet; thence south a distance of 1,320

feet to a point on the south line of the north tier of forties of said section 22; thence east a distance of 1,610 feet; thence north a distance of 1,320 feet to a point on the line between sections 14 and 23; thence west along said section line, a distance of 660 feet to the place of beginning, containing an area of 48.79 acres more or less: *Provided*, That livestock permitted to graze in adjoining national forest areas shall be allowed to drift across the land described herein to private land north thereof within the park."

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, perhaps an explanation of this amendment is desirable. It provides that the funds appropriated in this paragraph may be used for the maintenance of a road within an area which now lies outside the park but which under this amendment would lie inside the park. That area is a little less than 49 acres. A commission, of which I was a member, was appointed about two years ago to adjust the boundary between the Grand Canyon National Park and the adjacent national forest. We considered then the advisability of taking in this small area but found that by doing so we would entirely surround the property of a private owner. In order to avoid closing him in he agreed that the road might cross his land. Now he seeks considerable compensation for permitting the road to cross his property. Of course, it is desirable always that the roads pass only over park land. If we add this 49-acre piece we can maintain the road entirely on park lands.

To preserve this man's rights we provide that his cattle, pastured on adjacent forest lands, may be permitted to cross from the land of the national forest to his private land, though by doing so they cross through a narrow portion of the national park. I have consulted the Representative from the State of Arizona, where this man lives, and, if I may say so, contrary to the rules, with the Senator from Arizona, who was formerly a Member of this House, and I find it is satisfactory to them. That is all I care to say unless there are some questions to be asked.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand also that the gentleman has spoken with the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands about this?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; and with the Congressman from Arizona.

Mr. CRAMTON. In view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands has been consulted, I shall have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$5,350 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, not exceeding \$3,200 for maintenance of that part of the Wawona Road in the Sierra National Forest between the park boundary 2 miles north of Wawona and the park boundary near the Mariposa Grove of Big Trees, and not exceeding \$2,000 for maintenance of the road in the Stanislaus National Forest connecting the Tioga Road with the Hetch Hetchy Road near Mather Station, and including necessary expenses of a comprehensive study of the problems relating to the use and enjoyment of the Yosemite National Park, and the preservation of its natural features, \$290,000; for construction of physical improvements, \$95,000, of which not to exceed \$65,000 shall be available for water supply and camp-ground facilities at Glacier Point, \$8,000 for two comfort stations and two community buildings at the winter camp grounds, and \$6,000 for two employees' cottages; in all, \$385,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 95, line 2, strike out "\$95,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$97,250," and in line 6, after the word "cottages," insert "for the construction of a building to cover the sewage-disposal tank."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, under date of January 9 the Budget has submitted a supplemental estimate of \$2,250. In connection with it they say:

A report submitted on November 14, 1927, subsequent to the preparation of the Budget for 1929, by a sanitary engineer of the United States Public Health Service, on the operation of the sewage-treatment plant installed in 1921 at Yosemite National Park, shows that because of the large increase in the volume of sewage treated the odors from the plant have become so intolerable during the summer season as to require the early adoption of measures for the abatement of this nuisance. To

remedy the situation, it is proposed to cover the septic tanks with a reasonably tight inclosure which can be opened and closed at such times as will render the odors relatively unobjectionable.

So the item that accompanies this statement from the Budget is the amendment that I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Strike out the figures "\$385,000" and insert "\$387,250."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, etc., of roads and trails: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and the international boundary, and the Grand Canyon Highway from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park, as authorized by the act approved June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 423), to be immediately available and remain available until expended, \$2,500,000, which includes \$1,500,000, the remainder of the amount of the contractual authorization contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1928, approved January 12, 1927: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$9,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1929: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of \$4,000,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the construction of roads in national parks and monuments shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 9, line 24, after the colon insert: "*Provided further*, That balances of prior appropriations for construction of roads and trails in national parks shall remain available until expended."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations in this bill are so available and it had been supposed that appropriations made in prior years were likewise to be treated as available until expended, but it has been ruled by the Comptroller General that appropriations made for certain years heretofore were not. That complicates the situation, and it is rather difficult to unscramble the matter of bookkeeping. Therefore this amendment is suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Governor, \$7,000; secretary, \$3,600; in all, \$10,600.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I take it that after a law has become effective it is the province of the Appropriations Committee to provide appropriations for the carrying out of such a law and to see that the appropriations are economically and properly administered. Naturally the Appropriations Committee has nothing to do with general policies. While I have been critical of conditions in Alaska for several years, it is not my purpose to object to any appropriations; in fact, I expect

to vote for these appropriations, and I suspect they will be voted for unanimously; but I do wish to point out, very briefly, where, it seems to me, Congress itself, and perhaps governmental officials, have been lacking in their duty toward that Territorial possession.

In the President's message to Congress at the opening of the Sixty-ninth Congress we find this sentence—

The time has come for careful investigation of the expenditures and success of the laws by which we have undertaken to administer our outlying possessions. A very large amount of money is being expended for administration in Alaska. It appears so far out of proportion to the number of inhabitants and the amount of production as to indicate cause for thorough investigation.

This attitude of President Coolidge has been corroborated in numerous statements by the Secretary of the Interior. The Committee on Territories, as far back as 1923, made an intensive study of Alaska and recommended legislation which has remained dormant ever since. Therefore I say the day has come when we should not accept these items in appropriation bills in a pro forma manner and put them through as we do here. But, rather, we ought to go to the heart of such a subject as this and make an intensive study of the matters involved so as to change the system.

I did not intend to make any remarks in connection with this matter, as I have expressed my views very freely as to conditions in Alaska in previous Congresses, but night before last I happened to pick up a copy of the current number of the Atlantic Monthly and there I find a very exhaustive and dispassionate discussion, written by a man who probably knows more about conditions in Alaska—he did in the early days at any rate—than any other citizen except, perhaps, the Delegate from the Territory of Alaska. I do not wish to plagiarize from that article—written by Col. Wilds P. Richardson, of the United States Army, retired, and for whom the longest trail in Alaska is named—but I want to summarize the statements he makes in that article and call them to the attention of this House. He says this:

After 60 years of ownership, assertions about the Territory should be supported by a substantial showing of developed resources, wealth, and population.

He argues, in effect, that an inventory should be taken and that we should know something about where we stand in regard to Alaska. He says:

But the predicted inrushing of people following the construction of the railroad, the fast-growing cities, the population running into seven figures have not come true.

Further than that he calls attention to many other things we should do with respect to Alaska. You will hear, undoubtedly, an argument from the Delegate in a few moments, if he sees fit to make any reply to the statements I am making, and he will no doubt call your attention to how little it cost us to get Alaska, \$7,000,000. In that connection it might be said that we made the Louisiana Purchase and secured Florida very cheap, as dollars and cents go. Colonel Richardson in this article calls attention to the developments in those sections of this country and what has come from them, whereas Alaska has lain dormant.

He goes on to show that the construction of the railroad was, as we all know now, a very serious mistake, and that it was absolutely unjustified by any facts that can be brought before Congress. Some of us who were here at the time the Alaskan Railroad was advocated remember the propaganda that was issued and the methods which were used to put it across. It has involved the expenditure of \$70,000,000, and the very able manager of the railroad, Mr. Smith—who had long training with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and, I believe, is still an official of that company—to-day is gratified to be able to come before the committee of which our honored friend Mr. CRAMTON is chairman and inform us that for the first time the Alaskan Railroad deficit was under \$1,000,000. It is costing more than \$1,000,000 annually to keep up that road. Colonel Richardson says that that road costs us, if we charge up the interest account and everything of that kind, in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000 per year to maintain.

We are chasing rainbows in Alaska. Aside from the fisheries the only real asset they have is down in the southeast corner where an agreement has been made to get out some timber and wood pulp which is fairly accessible. Building a railroad way up there in the interior where there is no population is entirely different. The only customer of any size at the present time of that railroad is a private company using it to deliver ore.

Colonel Richardson goes on to say that the one hope, as he sees it, of an increased population in Alaska is to change our

immigration laws and get out propaganda to try to get people over there from the northern countries of Europe—Norway, Sweden, and Finland. I am not sure whether the former countrymen of our distinguished chairman [Mr. CHINDBLOM] would feel like migrating from such countries to northern Alaska; but this is the only type of people you can appeal to to go to Alaska and settle. The Scandinavians are the hardy kind that could withstand the climatic conditions. And even then, the Alaskan land office does not advise any settlers to come unless they can support themselves without going there. Here is what they say:

We do not advise settlers entering upon this land with the idea of getting their living entirely from the soil while improving their property.

There is just one further possibility other than the timber and fisheries, and that is an appeal to the tourists. This is where Colonel Richardson says there is a possibility of making some use of Alaska's property. The natural scenery is unsurpassed. It is marvelous scenery, and for about 10 or 12 weeks in the year, if there were accommodations, we could throw tourists in there by the thousands; but unfortunately, the entire arrangements for the care of people coming there are so limited that in spite of the hundreds of miles of travel one might make, you could more than put every tourist accommodation that is available in Alaska into one hotel along the line of the boardwalk in Atlantic City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. In line with the gentleman's remarks, we all know that most of the intellectuals were driven out of Russia and are now camping around in different localities of Europe. What would the gentleman think of our inviting them and offering them some inducements to go to Alaska?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am afraid we would run up against the immigration restrictions of our friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

I was just quoting Colonel Richardson as to the feasibility of endeavoring to secure people from these three nations. Very likely the colonel would include Russia as a part of it, and there would be just as much chance of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] agreeing to that sort of an amendment of the immigration law as for any other country.

Mr. DENISON. I would say to the gentleman that the Russians who have been driven out of Russia are the only ones I would be willing to have go to Alaska.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But they will not work.

Mr. DENISON. They would if they went to Alaska.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, we have some intellectuals here in this country that might be utilized. I agree with the gentleman's suggestion, at least, with respect to Alaska as a tourist country, and the gentleman, I am sure, appreciates that the neck of the bottle now is the lack of ocean transportation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Which we were very glad to allow the gentleman to include in his bill last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Our action last year permitted an appreciable improvement, but it is to be hoped that the companies that are carrying on this work will increase their facilities much more because on that is dependent the tourist traffic to Alaska.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let me add to the gentleman's suggestion that it would not be entirely a question of the people getting up to Alaska, it would be a matter of accommodations for them after they got there. The Government has gone into hotel building at one point, the township of Curry, named after our distinguished Member from California. There is a Government hotel there. If the gentleman intends at any time to advocate construction of hotels under Federal appropriations, that is another question; but unless you have much better accommodations than are available for tourists there now, you can not get money-spending tourists to go up into that country in large numbers or to return for a second visit.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I observe in this connection that as to the park the situation is one that we hope will never call for expensive hotels. We hope the tourists who go to the park will be willing to take quarters a little different from what they get at home, and the development in the park does

not need to progress rapidly until we get ocean facilities that will enable tourists to go there.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, no.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I am making this statement for his information. It is our thought, and I think the policy of the Government, to provide accommodations in the park to keep up with the tourist traffic. When it comes to towns outside, I am sure there will be quarters, although I fear they will not be as comfortable as are maintained in some of the splendid hotels of Massachusetts with which the gentleman is most familiar.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman permit a question, and I want to extend this also to the chairman of the subcommittee. Has any provision been made further than was made last year to increase the transportation facilities to Alaska?

Mr. CRAMTON. The hearings will show that, but the result I may say of the language the committee recommended and to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] was kind enough to withdraw his objection—the result of that authority to the Railroad Administration was materially to increase the facilities, and we hope that they will increase in the future.

Mr. DOWELL. Is there any way that we may increase them? It seems to me the objection raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts can easily be remedied when tourists arrive, for then there will be provision made if the tourists come.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct, but you will never get sufficient accommodations, scattered broadcast over that great Territory, to care for any large number, because you can not concentrate them sufficiently to make it a business proposition. The only way I see to extend beyond the camp roadhouse made of logs with paper and canvas partitions in which I spent some time, and similar facilities—the only way you are going to extend accommodations up there is through the same procedure that you took in building the road—take the money out of Uncle Sam's pocket. No business man will go up there as a hotel keeper on any extensive scale.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts devote his energies to creating facilities for tourists to go up there instead of devoting criticism of those who are now up there and trying to do the best they can?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not in the transportation business. I have agreed to vote for all appropriations you ask for Alaska; but, considering the fact that you have 25,000 white people scattered through the country, I say we are too lavish in expenditures. Take, for instance, the highway item alone. Last year the total highway appropriations are shown to be more than a half million dollars. That is, trails and roads for 25,000 people cost over a half million dollars.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then there is the climate.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes. The highways can only be used for 10 or 12 weeks on account of the snow. A portion of the railroad is built on a moving glacier and has to be reconstructed annually. It is no place for farming. The farm people say in this report that they do not wait for the frost to get out of the ground. They can not wait. Further than that, the other nine months of the year they are buried under avalanches of snow, and six months they are in practical darkness. You can not urge citizens to go to Alaska in order to increase the population. It seems to me that this question ought to be constructively taken up and something done about the statements that have been made by those interested in Alaska and by this last article of Colonel Richardson. You ought to do something besides appropriating millions of dollars in connection with Alaskan affairs. [Applause.]

In his last chapter Colonel Richardson says, "Let Alaska be offered to the traveling, touring, scenery-loving public." In effect, he advocates development for Alaska somewhat similar to that of the Yellowstone National Park, in order to make use of what appears to be Alaska's greatest asset, namely, its scenic beauty and the lure of the wild life still existing there. It seems to me that Colonel Richardson's viewpoint is most sane and practical. Every year predictions are made and much flowery language wasted in prophecies of Alaska's enormous future population. Mr. Chairman, we are chasing rainbows. Why should we not see to it that such practical suggestions of one as familiar with conditions as Colonel Richardson admit-

tedly is are used as a foundation for future legislation? Why is it that the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of the Interior have fallen on fallow ground? No matter how extravagant our appropriations may be or how much interest we may feel in Alaska, we have not the power to change nature. Alaska for 3 months out of 12 can be made an attractive playground for the American tourist, but for the other nine months, when buried in snow, and six months of the nine in darkness, it can never be made an El Dorado for comfort-loving American citizens.

I shall vote for the appropriations recommended in this bill, but I hope the time is not far distant when some practical effort can be made looking to a very material curtailment in these appropriations and a much more reasonable and practical attitude on the part of Congress toward Alaska's future.

Mr. VESTAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. VESTAL. Does the gentleman mean to convey to the membership of this House that this railway in Alaska can not be traveled over only four to six weeks each year?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; not the railway, as I believe large sums are expended for snow shoveling, but the use of the highways and trails is limited to a few weeks.

Mr. VESTAL. I left Fairbanks on the 17th day of September and drove out over the Richardson Highway. I had been there a month or six weeks.

Mr. TREADWAY. I said three months.

Mr. VESTAL. I understood the gentleman to say three weeks.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Did the gentleman, going into the consideration of the magazine article, form an opinion regarding the proposition of getting Europeans to go to Alaska?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is so apparently contrary to all our immigration provisions that it seems impractical. I think it an excellent suggestion if the people want to come there, and if we can get the immigration authorities to amend the immigration act and allow them to come I should be for it. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How would you keep them there?

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman will have to ask the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The Chairman. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in looking over the Record this morning to read the discussion in respect to the efficiency of the Pension Bureau, which occurred yesterday. I am much interested in that because I find from official records that Ohio has more pensioners than any other State in the Union—43,881 on July 30, 1927—and more pension money is expended there than in any other State in the Union—\$20,700,000 a year; also because of the great pressure upon the office of the Representative from the third district of Ohio, because in that district is concentrated the greatest number of pensioners of any district in the United States, and also of the location there of the central branch of the National Military Home at Dayton, Ohio. Therefore I take a special interest in the matter of this Pension Bureau appropriation.

It is perhaps too late to give it any consideration upon this bill, but I do ask that the Committee on Appropriations next year arrange for a definite survey of the situation in the Pension Office, and I make that suggestion because of what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations said in respect to the difficulty of ascertaining definitely how many employees are needed there in the course of the year. We now know that the Pension Office is six months or more behind on its work and that it has been behind in its work for more than two years. This causes a great deal of unnecessary work on the part of Members of Congress. We ought to have adequate appropriations for the Pension Bureau, so that it may be able to keep up with its work. I read with interest the complaint of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Newton], and I agree with him that this bureau should have sufficient money so that they will be able to give proper consideration and reply to the communications of Members of Congress in respect to matters upon which Members have spent considerable time.

If I understand the matter correctly, when the estimates were made up for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, the Pension Commissioner showed a need for \$1,190,000 to provide the requisite personnel to take care of the work. A great and

unusual burden had been put upon him by the removal of the Pension Office from the old building to the Interior Building. This amount of \$1,190,000 was approved by the Budget Commission, but was reduced by the Committee on Appropriations of this House, and the bill when introduced and passed by the House in the last Congress, carried but \$1,132,000, or a deficit of \$58,000 in what the Pension Commission had testified was required. When the bill went to the Senate, the matter was investigated and the amount of the appropriation raised to \$1,190,000, being the amount actually necessary to give the service required under the law. This difference between the House and Senate threw the bill into conference, and the representatives of the Appropriations Committee of the House secured a concession so that the bill as finally passed carried but \$1,160,000 for a work which actually required the expenditure of \$1,190,000. This means that the personnel of the Pension Bureau must be further cut down, the work retarded, and great additional burdens put upon the Members of Congress who are the recipient of continuous complaints because the Pension Bureau is physically unable, with its force so limited by the appropriation of Congress, to function as it should. I understand upon reliable authority that this year the Pension Commissioner certified that the work of the Pension Bureau would require an appropriation of \$1,190,000 in order to function efficiently; that this amount was cut to \$1,150,000 before the Budget reached Congress, probably in view of the action of the House committee in the last Congress.

We are now going into another year with the Pension Bureau crippled with insufficient employees, unable to properly fulfill its mission, and with thousands of the most pathetic and appealing cases of the rapidly dying veterans of the Civil War delayed until death must inevitably overtake hundreds of them before action can be had upon their claims which are crowding the Pension Office beyond its capacity to function under the restricted appropriations of the Congress. There are now only about 90,000 Union veterans of the Civil War left to us.

In the name of the veterans of the Civil and Spanish Wars, I protest against this treatment of the Pension Bureau. Because my office has, and has had for years, perhaps, more correspondence with the Pension Bureau than any other office in Congress, I am in a position to judge of the efficiency of its work. I here state that I have found the most energetic and sympathetic attitude in the Commissioner of Pensions and have understood that the delays experienced in correspondence and in action on claims were aggravated by, in fact due entirely to, inadequate personnel, due in turn to restricted appropriations by Congress. The situation in the last year or two has been seriously complicated by the removal of all the pension records and files from the old building to the new, and this alone has thrown back some of the work at least six months.

My experience with the Patent Office leads me to believe that that office is also suffering from niggardly treatment. More liberal appropriations should be made for the Patent Office. The prosperity of this country depends upon every legitimate safeguard being given by the Government to the development of manufacturing and commerce, while every sentiment of loyalty and gratitude requires prompt action from our Pension Bureau on behalf of those who served to defend the country and her institutions in time of need and to whom delay in adjudicating claims is so often equivalent to denial. It being too late now to remedy this matter in the House at this time on the present bill, I hope that a full investigation will be had by the Senate committee and adequate provision made for the work of the bureau, and I trust that the Representatives of this House on any conference committee will see to it that ample funds are provided for this work which is so near to the hearts of our people.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and contingent expenses, clerk hire, not to exceed \$2,800; janitor service for the governor's office and the executive mansion, not to exceed \$2,760; traveling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business, and of the secretary of the Territory while traveling on official business under direction of the governor; rent of executive offices, repair and preservation of governor's house and furniture; for care of grounds and purchase of necessary equipment; stationery, lights, water, and fuel; in all, \$14,000, to be expended under the direction of the governor.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 101, line 14, strike out "\$2,800" and insert "\$3,520."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this does not increase the appropriation in this paragraph, but it increases the allocation available for clerk hire.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, which will explain this amendment and the necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 13, 1928.

HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,

Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: In H. R. 9136, entitled "A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes," which was reported out of the House Committee on Appropriations January 11, 1928, on page 105 there is the following language:

"For incidental and contingent expenses, clerk hire, not to exceed \$2,800; janitor service for the governor's office and the executive mansion, not to exceed \$2,760; traveling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business, and of the secretary of the Territory while traveling on official business under direction of the governor; rent of executive offices, repair and preservation of governor's house and furniture; for care of grounds and purchase of necessary equipment; stationery, lights, water, and fuel; in all, \$14,000, to be expended under the direction of the governor."

The representative of the department at the time of the hearing on the bill suggested (see p. 1146 of the hearings on the bill) that:

"In the appropriation for the present fiscal year for incidental and contingent expenses in the office of the governor, clerk hire is fixed at not to exceed \$2,800. The governor is very desirous of increasing this amount to \$3,520 in order to give him more money for that purpose. It does not increase the amount of the estimate. The governor in discussing the subject in a letter dated December 10, 1927, stated, among other things, that—

"In Alaska the secretary to the governor occupies a very responsible position. He is charged with the general supervision of the office, and in the absence of the governor is responsible for proper conduct of the work. The salary paid is not commensurate with salaries for similar positions in the Territory, and if the salary had not been augmented by an appropriation of \$720 from the Territorial fund it would be impossible to obtain the services of a competent man, especially in view of the salary increases that have been made throughout the Government service in the past 10 years. A suit is now pending in the district court at Juneau, Alaska, attacking the validity of a Territorial appropriation of \$720 which he has been paid in the past, and it is likely that hereafter the Territory will be estopped from making any contribution to the salary of the governor's secretary. He is a Federal employee, and his entire salary should be paid by the Federal Government. I am advised that if the limitation of \$2,800 now contained in the appropriation bill is changed, and there are sufficient funds in the appropriation, we may expend for clerical hire up to the amount fixed by Congress. The changing of the limitation in the appropriation bill as suggested will not increase the total appropriation asked for, but will make it necessary for us to rearrange the budget in the governor's office. I believe this can be done, and it is recommended that the limitation of \$2,800 be changed so that we may have an authorization for clerical hire not to exceed \$3,520."

For the reasons above stated I have to request that the bill be amended by striking out the figures "2,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "3,520." This does not increase the appropriation over that provided for in the bill, but allows the governor some latitude in the matter of the salaries to be paid for clerk hire.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Governor, \$10,000; secretary, \$5,400; in all, \$15,400.

For contingent expenses, to be expended by the governor, for stationery, postage, and incidentals, \$1,000; private secretary to the governor, \$3,000; temporary clerk hire, \$500; for traveling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business, \$500; in all, \$5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to have the type in lines 13 and 14, page 108, of the language "temporary clerk hire, \$500," changed from italics to roman.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, sundry messages in writing from the President were presented to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

On January 11, 1928:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims.

On January 12, 1928:

H. R. 6657. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.

On January 13, 1928:

H. R. 483. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings.

The committee resumed its session.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

The Clerk read as follows:

Legislative expenses: For furniture, light, telephone, stationery, record casings and files, printing and binding, including printing, publications, and binding of the session laws and the house and senate journals, indexing records, postage, ice, water, clerk hire, mileage of members, and incidentals, pay of chaplain, clerk, sergeant at arms, stenographers, typewriters, janitors, and messengers, \$30,000: *Provided*, That the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall not draw their compensation of \$200 or any mileage for an extra session, held in compliance with section 54 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Page 108, line 23, strike out the figures "\$30,000" and substitute therefor the figures "\$50,000"; line 25, strike out "\$200" and substitute "\$500."

The CHAIRMAN. Consideration will be given to the first amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, according to the organic act, the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall have 15 members of the senate and shall have 30 members of the house—45 members in the legislature in all. By further Federal enactment these members of the Hawaiian Legislature shall be paid the sum of \$1,000 per session of the legislature, which occurs once every two years. The total sum to pay for the mandatory salaries of these legislators exceeds by \$15,000 the sum allowed here for legislative expenses, and besides their statutory salaries, the members are to be paid the sum of 20 cents per mile for traveling expenses involved in attending the session. In 1904, when the first legislature of the Territory met under the organic act, they were allowed the sum of \$24,500 by Federal appropriation. They were at that time by statutory Federal enactment allowed the sum of \$600 salary. In 1910 the sum allowed for Federal appropriation was raised to \$30,000, at which figure it has remained up until the present time, including these estimates. In 1920 the salary of the legislators was raised by Federal enactment from \$600 to \$1,000, but the total sum has not been changed.

The total expenses of the Territorial legislature have risen from the figures that were covered at that time by the Federal appropriation until at the present time the expenditures of the last legislature totaled \$130,000, of which the Territory of Hawaii provided the sum of \$100,000.

The legislature at its last session passed a joint resolution memorializing Congress asking that the Federal share of the legislative expenses might be raised an appreciable amount, and the governor of the Territory has suggested the sum of \$20,000. I submitted the matter to the Director of the Budget and I have not yet been able to get an answer.

As to the second amendment, on line 25, the sum of \$200 is given. By statute the sum was fixed at \$500. I think undoubtedly it ought to be corrected and made to conform to the existing statute.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the matter of the contribution to the expenses of Hawaii has been stationary for a number of years. I do not understand that the Delegate from Hawaii has had full opportunity for the Budget or the department to fully consider his claim. The amount proposed in this bill is the same as it has been for many years. I would prefer that the Delegate from Hawaii be given opportunity to present his proposition fully in the make-up of the next Budget rather than to accept the proposition here. I think, therefore, the amendment ought not to be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Hawaii offered another amendment. With reference to that amendment, that is simply to correct the phraseology. It refers to the salary of the members of the legislature, and says they shall not receive salary at certain special sessions—that is, when appropriation bills are considered. The law is changed, and instead of \$200 salary it is now \$500. The phraseology should be changed as the gentleman suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Page 108, line 25, strike out the figures "\$200" and substitute the figures "\$500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital for the Insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the quartermaster's service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, and beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, and including not to exceed \$285,000 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds and for additional fire-protection equipment, \$913,000, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers, for which payment may be made in advance, as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1929 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeths Hospital upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the developments made before the District Committee show conclusively that the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum, Dr. William A. White, is not a proper official to have charge of these 4,000 helpless inmates or to expend annually this vast sum of money which Congress appropriates for it.

He is protected by the Secretary of the Interior, who himself is a psychiatrist and has been in charge of a similar hospital in his State of Colorado in years gone by, and it is a well-known fact that among all such superintendents there is a fellow feeling that they must protect each other. Were it not for this fact Superintendent White could not stay there a day.

I want my colleagues to remember this, because it is important: There are eight departments of the Government now that by a mere order or a scratch of a pen from the chief can confine individuals to this insane asylum, with no hearing in court, with no chance of redress, and no opportunity of getting out. How much longer is Congress going to let that condition prevail? How much longer time is to elapse before Congress or its committees can frame and pass legislation that will stop it?

I maintain that there is not a department of Government that ought to have that power. When you send a person to a penitentiary he is sent for a term. When his term expires he goes free, and the world is prone to forget the crime he has committed and to give him a new start and a new chance. Aye, when a prisoner is sent to a penitentiary for life he still has a chance of being pardoned or having his term commuted and getting out and starting over again. But when you incarcerate a person in an insane asylum his future is ended. If he is able to go into the court by habeas corpus proceedings he may be able to get out, but the fact that he has been charged with insanity and has been in an insane asylum follows him all the rest of his days. It is something he can not get rid of.

I maintain that this Congress ought to pass a law providing that no department of the Government can send any person to an insane asylum until that person has been adjudged insane by a competent court, by a jury of his peers, in accordance with proper law.

The present law says that these six departments can send them there without a judgment of court, without a hearing in court, without their day in court and the opportunity of testifying in their own behalf and having other witnesses testify. But it presupposes that within 90 days the superintendent of St. Elizabeths will give them a hearing in court. Yet I have in my files case after case in that institution where they have been kept there a dozen years and have not been given a hearing or a chance to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean to assert that there have been inmates in this institution for a dozen years without a hearing in court?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Since I have been bringing this matter to the attention of Congress there have been sixty-odd inmates who have gone into the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on habeas corpus writs and presented their cases to a jury of their peers and have been discharged as sane by the verdict of the jury and judgment of the court, which forced the superintendent to discharge them.

I wonder if you know that your Secretary of the Navy can by the mere scratch of a pen send any man in the Naval Establishment to St. Elizabeths at will. There is no power that keeps him from it, and the law authorizes him to do it. He has the authority of law to do it. Is that a power that he should be possessed of? Do you know that your Secretary of War can do it? Do you know that the Commissioners of this District can do it? It ought to be stopped. It is not a responsibility that rests alone upon my shoulders. It is a responsibility that rests upon the shoulders of every Congressman and Senator in the Seventieth Congress. Is it so that I am the only one here concerned about this matter?

I went before a naval board and I had your Secretary of the Navy force Doctor White to bring a young naval officer from Georgia before a board. I conducted the examination and I showed that he was sane.

Let me quote you some of the evidence I offered in his behalf:

SWORN TESTIMONY OF DR. F. A. MOSS, HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

I have studied Lieut. Commander Harry T. Sandlin almost daily for the last two weeks, during which time I have spent more than 50 hours going into all phases of his case. In addition to making a careful study of his history and giving him the usual subjective examination made by psychiatrists, I gave him a number of objective standardized tests with the hope of putting his case, in part at least, on a fact rather than an opinion basis.

In all the objective tests Mr. Sandlin's showing was that of a person with a normal mind. On the Army alpha test he made a score of 151, which is above the average for the officers in the Army and is

10 points above the average for university students. On the will temperament test his reactions were all within the normal limits. In his test for judgment in abstract relationships he shows a superior performance. His poorest showing was on the test calling for judgment in dealing with other people, and this defect, in my opinion, accounts in no small part for his present difficulty; for it is this shortcoming which often causes him to evaluate improperly the way others will interpret his acts. This, however, is not an indication of insanity, for some of our most intelligent people do not get along very well with others.

With the hope of discovering some objective evidence of his so-called "complexes," I gave him the association test devised for this purpose and described by Dr. William A. White on page 352 of his *Outlines of Psychiatry*. This test gave absolutely no indication either of an inferiority complex or of an abnormal attachment to his mother.

His neurological examination was negative. His family history showed no taint of insanity, and is what I would term a fairly normal family history. His previous personal history shows little of value in explaining the present difficulty, which really began with his first marriage and culminated in the recent court action in Boston.

At first I found it considerably difficult to reconcile some of his letters and telegrams with my other findings, but it is my opinion that the explanation of his present difficulty can be traced to his unfortunate marriage with the first Mrs. Sandlin. From the history it would seem that she is more or less of an adventuress, and that when they had separated she deliberately set about to cause him all the embarrassment possible. After several years of prolonged worry and uncertainty he finally succeeded in settling with her by paying her the lump sum of \$6,400. But one and a half years after the final payment he found himself suddenly ordered to Boston to face a new action brought by her. At this time he had married again, and had two young children to support. His judgment in sending the letters and telegrams to Secretary Wilbur was admittedly poor, but I believe that these can be attributed in no small part to the excessive annoyance to which he was subjected by the tantalizing tactics of the first Mrs. Sandlin, who was aided by certain unsuspecting naval officers.

In spite of all the harassing that he has gone through he manifests at present no clear-cut symptoms of paranoia or of a paranoid state. He has no hallucinations, either visual or auditory. He neither has at present, nor has he had, any "hypochondriacal ideas." No period of "marked emotional depression," no clear-cut "ideas of reference," no "delusions of explanation," and no greatly exaggerated feelings either of "self-importance" or of "inferiority" can be found in the case. I was unable to find any "retrospective falsifications of memory," and I am positive that he has no mental deterioration. Yet all these, according to White's *Outlines of Psychiatry*, pages 109-113, are the signs by which one may recognize paranoia and paranoid states. His natural resentment at being thrown into an asylum for the insane might be termed an indication of a delusion of persecution, but his explanation of this feeling is too clear cut to permit one to believe that he has a definite, systematized delusional system, for he manifests no resentment at any particular individual, and only attributes his misfortune to the system under which he is working. Such being his attitude, I see nothing to make me suspect that he may do violence to any one, nor can I find any other reason for his being locked up in an asylum for the insane.

F. A. Moss,

Head Department of Psychology,
George Washington University.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of January, 1927.

[SEAL.]

JAMES M. WOODWARD,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

Then Dr. S. F. Acree, being duly sworn, testified before said naval board as follows:

My name is S. F. Acree, am 51 years old, entered State University of Texas in 1892, graduated there with degree of Bachelor of Science, then went to University of Chicago, where I received a Ph. D. in 1902, then spent 1903-4 in University of Berlin; I have been abroad five times, besides university work and chemical researches; I have been a teacher in Johns Hopkins University and Wisconsin and Syracuse Universities. I have published over 100 articles in various lines of chemistry in which I have been interested. I have been invited to give numerous addresses, and I was invited to make an address before the Faraday Society of Great Britain. I have appeared in a number of lectures involving chemistry and I have been connected with the direction of two plants for the commercial development of some of my processes; I was acquainted with Commander Sandlin while he was under observation in the Naval Hospital here in Washington; from August to October, 1925, we were at the same boarding house; I have talked to Commander Sandlin a great deal on subjects of current interest; I have been interested in naval subjects; we were a great deal together socially, and we were better acquainted with them than with any other family here, and that intimacy still exists; I have had occasion to note the conduct of Commander Sandlin with regard to the condition of his mind, and my opinion is based on continual contact with the medical men of

Johns Hopkins University, with whom I ate daily, taught medical students myself, having been on the staff of the Highland Hospital in Rochester, N. Y., having been friends of people interested in psychiatry in general; I did not even know at first, when I met Commander Sandlin, or for some time afterwards, that he was under observation in the Naval Hospital, and never suspected any such thing from any talk with him. I learned it after three months' acquaintance with him, and I have carefully watched his talk. I did not observe anything abnormal about him. He was to my mind an unusually fine man. He never tried to force on us Christian Science, or any such ideas. He was very fair, indeed. When I learned that Commander Sandlin was in St. Elizabeths I went over there. To my astonishment I found that he was the same well-poised, fair-minded man I had known before; I believe that Commander Sandlin is of sound mind; I do not believe that he is potentially dangerous to society—not in the slightest; since he has been let out of St. Elizabeths he has been a free agent, going where he pleased, and doing what he pleased; I have been attracted to him; I do not believe there is anything in the world the matter with his mind; a psychiatrist whom I know says he believes every person is a paranoid; with regard to the suggestion that Commander Sandlin made to the Navy, there is not anything that would indicate an unsoundness of mind; I called on Congressman BLANTON, my old schoolmate, to see that my friend got justice; I feel that Commander Sandlin has been misunderstood because he expresses himself in an unusually brilliant way.

He had been adjudged insane and kept in St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum for two months before I found him. And after I placed the evidence before the naval board, four out of five decided that he was not insane, and I forced the Navy Department to release him and discharge him. But they retired him, and they hold now, under a ruling of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, that even after they retire an officer they still have jurisdiction over him, and if the Secretary sees fit he can order him back to St. Elizabeths any time he wants to, although he is retired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman said there were a number of the Government departments that had the right to do this. The gentleman has named three of them, and I am very much interested in knowing the other departments that can do the same thing.

Mr. BLANTON. There are eight of them, and I will name them. You will remember that in response to my resolution which the House passed, Gen. J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States, between July 1 and December 1, 1926, made an exhaustive investigation of St. Elizabeths, and he made a report to Congress embracing 175 printed pages. In such report General McCarl certifies that under existing laws St. Elizabeths receives men and women for incarceration upon the mere order or request of the following heads of departments, to wit:

(1) From the Secretary of War—persons belonging to the Army, civilian employees in the Quartermaster Corps, interned persons, and prisoners of war; (2) from the Secretary of the Navy—insane persons belonging to the Navy and Marine Corps, naval interned persons, and prisoners of war; (3) from the Secretary of the Treasury—insane persons belonging to the Coast Guard, insane patients of the Public Health Service, merchant seamen, officers and crew of the several vessels belonging to the Bureau of Fisheries, ex-service men hospitalized by virtue of the war risk insurance act, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, discharged Army and Navy nurses, seamen on boats of Mississippi River Commission, employees in Lighthouse Service, civilian employees on Army transports, and civilian employees entitled to treatment under the United States employees' compensation act; (4) from the Secretary of the Interior—insane American citizens in the Canal Zone, persons charged with Federal offenses, persons convicted of Federal offenses; (5) from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau—all ex-service men, veterans of the World War who come under his jurisdiction; (6) from the president of the Board of Commissioners of Soldiers' Home—inmates of the Soldiers' Home; (7) from the president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—inmates of the national home; (8) from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—indigent patients and alleged insane persons of homicidal or otherwise dangerous tendencies pending formal commitment.

You will note that he lists eight different departments of this Government whose heads the law now gives the right to order human beings into an insane asylum without due hearing in court. General McCarl further certified:

These patients come from all walks of life and represent most every vocation and profession. There are patients who were lawyers, doctors, business men, machinists, common and skilled laborers; teachers, nurses,

musicians, artists, authors, and writers; officers and men committed from the United States Army and Navy and Marine Corps; retired officers and men of the United States Army and Marine Corps; veterans of the Civil, Spanish, and the World Wars; women who come from the various social strata, mothers, wives, and unmarried girls. There are also insane criminals and the criminally insane committed from Federal prisons and by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Dr. William A. White testified under oath and our Gibson investigating committee unanimously found that there are 2,200 people incarcerated in St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum who have never been adjudged insane and who have never been given a trial to establish their sanity.

Note that General McCarl certified that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury all can order men in this insane asylum. And they can do it without giving these men a proper hearing. By the mere scratch of a pen they can doom a man to St. Elizabeths, an insane asylum. It ought to stop. It exists because the people of the United States have not known it and they do not know it now, but I am bringing it to your attention, and I hope you will help me stop it. I hope you will help me get a bill passed through this House before we adjourn that will take that power from every department of this Government, so that before they can send a man to an insane asylum they must give him a hearing before a court and have him properly adjudged insane under the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In Texas we have tribunals constituted which require a trial before anyone can be adjudged insane.

Mr. BLANTON. And very rightly so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that ought to be the law of the Nation as well as of the States?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. It ought to be the law. Let me say to my colleague from Texas that I would rather to-day you would adjudge me guilty and send me to a penitentiary for 20 years than to send me out to St. Elizabeths Asylum charged with insanity, from what I know about that institution, because I would have a chance to get out of the penitentiary and a chance to show my innocence of the charge upon which I was sentenced, but when once the doors of St. Elizabeths are closed on an insane victim he rarely ever gets a chance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes, because I want to answer some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I am in sympathy with much the gentleman is saying.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any part of that which I am saying with which the gentleman is not in sympathy?

Mr. HUDSON. No; I think not, but I did not think the gentleman would have any complaint to make to-day after having won such a signal victory in getting the Democratic convention to meet in the State of Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am not now talking politics.

Mr. HUDSON. I know the gentleman is not.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I did not know that the conditions to which the gentleman refers existed here. Does the gentleman mean to say that a person can be sent to St. Elizabeths without judicial procedure?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Secretary Mellon has done it, and Secretary Wilbur has done it. Your Secretary of War has done it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman stated he would rather be sent to a penitentiary than to St. Elizabeths, and I know he would have rather been sentenced to a penitentiary in Texas three years ago because he would probably have gotten a pardon at that time.

Mr. BLANTON. I never did stand in with that particular pardoning power down there.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have just been wondering how the gentleman would provide for such trials by the civil courts in the case of men in the Navy or the Army or the Coast Guard, the latter service being under the Treasury Department.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask my friend from Kentucky this? Suppose the gentleman joined the Military Establishment or the Naval Establishment, does the gentleman surrender all of his rights civilly as a citizen? Does the gentleman by engaging in the military service in behalf of his flag in peace time or during war, thereby give the Secretary of that department the right to send him to an insane asylum without a hearing in court?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman is not a Yankee and he has no right to answer my question by asking me one. But is not this a proper authority for the Army and the Navy to have? How could you bring these men in and have them tried before the civil courts? The question of testing a man's sanity is certainly of no higher right than to pass upon his life and liberty, and we permit the Army and the Navy to try these men and in certain cases on conviction to put them to death. I do not understand that the Secretary of the Navy assumes the power or has the power to merely say, "Here, I send this man to the insane asylum." Is there not in every case a trial?

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not take up all of my three minutes, because I want to answer the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is not a soldier or sailor tried by a competent court-martial before such action is ever taken?

Mr. BLANTON. No. Rarely is he given a proper hearing. I do not think the Navy is competent to try the question of the sanity of a man. I think that is a personal right that ought to be adjudicated in a courthouse before a jury of his peers. I do not think the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Treasury ought to leave that to some subordinate officer and then approve such action by ordering him into an asylum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is not such a court-martial a part of our judicial system? It is our means of trying cases arising in the Army and Navy.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more. This is an important question, and I have given it great study.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to my friend from Kentucky—

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Let me continue just a little further so the gentleman can answer the question entirely at one time. Are not the courts-martial provided by the Army and the Navy part of the judicial system of this country, only they are restricted to dealing with men in the Army and the Navy?

Mr. BLANTON. No; they are not. Why, I have seen courts-martial in the Army and in the Navy when the ones who were trying the accused or the ones governing the body knew nothing in the world about law, knew nothing in the world about the rules of evidence and cared less about the rules of evidence. They admitted anything they wanted to admit and excluded everything they wanted to keep out.

I am one of those who believes that in peace times there ought not to be any court-martial in the Army or in the Navy. There ought to be the right to dismiss from the service for cause, reserved when they enlist, but when they commit crime, let them be tried in the courts. Oh, I have seen so many farcical courts-martial in the Army and Navy in peace times that I have become disgusted with them. I have been checking them up here for the last 10 years.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman, but I do not want to be diverted from St. Elizabeths.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No; I am interested in what the gentleman has stated, and I want to ask for information. Are not the boards that determine the sanity or insanity of a soldier or sailor from the Medical Department of the Army or of the Navy? We know they have a large corps of eminent medical men in both services, and my question is whether the service appoints such a board from the Medical Corps, which then determines the sanity or insanity of a man, which is somewhat comparable with such cases in civil life?

Mr. BLANTON. In the case of Lieutenant Commander Sandlin, they first ordered him to St. Elizabeths without any hearing. He was kept there about two months. He and his friends appealed to me, and I went out there and found he was absolutely sane, in my judgment, after a close, rigid cross-examination which I gave him. I demanded from the Navy a hearing before a board. They convened their board of five members,

two being doctors, without notifying me, and without hearing a witness, they took him off into a room and would not even allow his wife to be present. Without anyone being present, that board of five members found him insane and so reported to the Secretary without a hearing. Then when I went before them they would not set the proceeding aside and hear the matter again de novo. They said if he could prove by evidence that the decision was wrong they would set it aside, but he had to prove his sanity first. And Secretary Wilbur upheld them in it. He did this and that very board by a vote of four out of five found him sane after I proceeded to prove his sanity, and he is now in his own home attending to his own business.

Let me show you what the wife of Commander Harry T. Sandlin says about it:

AFFIDAVIT OF MRS. BETTY SANDLIN

I, Mrs. Betty Sandlin, being duly sworn, upon oath, state: I am the wife of Lieut. Commander Harry T. Sandlin, who is now perfectly sane, and never during our married life has had one single thing the matter with his mind; he is unusually bright and well poised; the Navy is punishing him simply because he took up the study of Christian Science, and appealed direct to Secretary Wilbur for fair treatment, when he should have sent his letter through channels; wholly without warrant or trial the Navy had my husband locked up in St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum on November 8, 1926, and until Congressman BLANTON visited him there on December 14, 1926, he was shown no consideration whatever, but after Congressman BLANTON obtained my husband's record, and in the House of Representatives on December 15, 1926, condemned the Navy for its unwarrantable action, he was allowed to leave St. Elizabeths, and spent Christmas week at home with me and our two little children, and since December 31, 1926, has been allowed to stay at home and do what he pleased, except they had him report one night and required him to telephone St. Elizabeths about once a week; under orders from the Navy my husband appeared before the Naval Retiring Board January 3, 1927; they refused his request that I be allowed to act as his counsel, as I wanted to attend; the board consisted of five captains; the two medical members took my husband into a closed room for examination; on their return, Captain Carpenter, chairman, announced that he found my husband to be "paranoid state, condition permanent"; the other medical member concurred; the board approved, and announced that my husband did not have mental capacity to select his own counsel, and they would have had Secretary Wilbur appoint one, and adjourned until next morning; we went immediately to the Capitol, called Congressman BLANTON out of the House, and urged him to save us, and to see that we got justice, as we were not financially able to employ counsel; our friends also urged him, and he secured permission from Secretary Wilbur to conduct our defense at such hearing; he promptly appeared at said trial on the morning of January 4, 1927, but had said board to understand distinctly that in conducting my husband's defense, he did not appear as his attorney, but in his representative capacity, to see that an American got a square deal, and also to learn just how the Navy conducted such trials, where men without court trial could be consigned to insane asylums for life simply upon Navy orders; the hearings were held in the forenoon, so Congressman BLANTON could attend House sessions at noon; he conducted my husband's defense four days, and by competent evidence not only established my husband's sanity, but proved that the Navy was persecuting him; the chairman, Captain Carpenter, and his counsel, saw that they must get rid of Congressman BLANTON; at the close of the hearing on January 7, 1927, Chairman Carpenter ruled that if Congressman BLANTON appeared any further he must do so as my husband's attorney and not in his representative capacity, knowing at the time he would not do so, hence Congressman BLANTON refused to appear further; Congressman BLANTON had made Captain Carpenter admit that he had prejudged my husband's case, basing his decision that he was of paranoid state simply because he had communicated direct with Secretary Wilbur, and because an officer at Key West once reported that my husband refused to give up his duty there; such officer so reporting had himself been under mental observation for a year, and I personally know that his report was false, because I was then with my husband when he turned over his office strictly in accord with the naval order and regulations; and in deciding the case Chairman Carpenter still held that my husband was of paranoid state, despite the fact that the other four members of the board changed their preliminary decision and held that he was not; I believe that if it had not been for Congressman BLANTON protecting us that naval board would have condemned my husband to St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum for life, when he is absolutely sane.

BETTY SANDLIN,

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 7th of March, 1927.

[SEAL.]

WALTER C. NEILSON,

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

It is an outrage upon common decency and justice for the Army and Navy thus to put sane men into insane asylums without proper hearings.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Do I understand that they put him in the asylum before there was a hearing before the board at all?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. They ordered him out there and kept him shut up for nearly two months.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is what I think is important.

Mr. BLANTON. And it was the Medical Corps of the Navy that did it. It was this Medical Corps of which the gentleman from Nebraska speaks so eloquently.

I hope my colleagues will help remedy this situation. It is our common responsibility. It is something which all of us should be interested in. Do not place it all on me. I need your help, and the people who have their rights taken away from them need your help. Please help us get a law passed to stop it. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For medical and surgical building, \$400,000; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the erection of this building at a cost, including equipment, not to exceed \$875,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 111, line 11, after the figures "\$400,000," insert a comma and the following language: "including the cost of advertising for proposals, preparation of plans, and supervision of work, to be immediately available."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment itself is explanatory, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the letter of the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 12, 1928.

The Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,

Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: In H. R. 9186, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, reported January 11, 1928, on page 111, and under the heading of St. Elizabeths Hospital, there is the following language:

"For medical and surgical building, \$400,000; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the erection of this building at a cost, including equipment, not to exceed \$875,000."

Representatives of St. Elizabeths Hospital suggested, as noted in the hearings, page 1167, that there be added to the foregoing language the following: "including cost of advertising for proposals, preparation of plans, and supervision of work; to be immediately available."

Similar language is included in the authorization for additional buildings for Freedmen's Hospital in the committee's bill, and I believe that it is just as essential for such language to be added to the authorization for the building for St. Elizabeths Hospital.

I submit this for your earnest consideration.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK, Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries: For payment in full or in part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, the balance to be paid from privately contributed funds, \$160,000, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph that it is an appropriation not authorized by law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if I had not learned by experience in the past that it would do no good to make an appeal to the gentleman from Mississippi to withdraw his point of order, I should endeavor to make such an appeal to him, for the appropriation is so very desirable. I have to admit, however, that it is not authorized by existing law.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman from Mississippi withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. LOWREY. I will reserve it.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. I am sorry to have the point of order made. It seems to me that this is a very valuable service that is being rendered here in our National Capital by the Howard University. However, at this time it would not be wise to take up the time of the House, and since I have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I will take advantage of it.

I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. I am surprised that there should be any opposition to a system of education that would fit the colored race for general human service. I think we should encourage education in Howard University and I do not think the color of the students ought to make any difference whatever in encouraging education.

I know that when I was a student in college in Michigan, I sat next in class to a colored boy and we followed Caesar together through the three parts of Gaul. I found him a good, honest, hard-working student.

Last month at a meeting of Washington City Congregational Club I had the pleasure of sitting at the speaker's table and eating dinner with Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, the distinguished president of Howard University. Doctor Johnson was the principal speaker of the evening. He gave one of the most learned and finished addresses I have had the pleasure of listening to recently. Doctor Johnson is a great educator and a fine administrator. Any investment that the Congress sees fit to make in Howard University will bring splendid returns.

Howard University has had a long and honorable career. It was organized by act of Congress March 2, 1867, about two years after the close of the Civil War. Since that time Congress has appropriated about \$5,000,000 for its support and maintenance. The legality of this appropriation has often been raised. Ever since I have been a Member of this body the annual appropriation extending financial assistance to Howard University has been passed after the most vigorous opposition and protest of the Democratic membership of the House. This uncertainty as a financial support should cease. We therefore propose to write the following measure into permanent law as soon as the legislative committee can bring in the bill:

Annual appropriations are hereby authorized to aid in the construction, development, improvement, and maintenance of the university, no part of which shall be used for religious instruction. The university shall at all time be open to inspection by the Bureau of Education and shall be inspected by the said bureau at least once each year. An annual report making a full exhibit of the affairs of the university shall be presented to Congress each year in the report of the Bureau of Education.

Howard University has an attendance of about 2,000 students, who are required to pay tuition and provide for their own living expenses. It has been thoroughly investigated by the college rating board of the Maryland and Middle States district and rated in class A. Thirty-eight States and 13 countries are represented in its attendance. President Durkee gave it as his judgment that fully 97 per cent of those who have attended Howard University have "stood up in the country as centers of influence for good."

There is a strong practical reason why a school like Howard University should be maintained in the District of Columbia. The Freedmen's Hospital was authorized by Congress in 1904, and was built upon land owned by Howard University. The university generously leased the land to the Federal Government for 99 years at \$1 a year, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. The existence of this hospital so near the medical school of Howard University affords the students of the university an opportunity which exists nowhere else in this country to acquire the clinical instruction which is necessary to complete each student's medical course. On the other hand, this opportunity exists for white students in every State of the Union.

In addition to the great importance to the country of having an institution capable of developing trained leaders for the colored race in all walks of life, the urgent necessity of making possible a supply of properly trained physicians of that race for the protection of the health of all our people, white as well as black, must be plain to every fair-minded American citizen.

I believe that Howard University has entered upon the most successful period of its history. Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson was unanimously elected president by the board of trustees and is one of America's great college presidents. Doctor Johnson is the first colored man to serve as president of the university. He was graduated in 1911 from Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., with the degree of bachelor of arts. Doctor Johnson was retained for two years in his alma mater as professor of economics and history. In 1913 he received the degree of bachelor of arts from the University of Chicago. He was graduated from the Rochester Theological Seminary in 1919.

Later he was pastor of the First Baptist Church of Charleston, W. Va. He received the degree of bachelor of divinity from Rochester Theological Seminary on his historical thesis entitled "The Rise of the Knights Templar." He was graduated from Howard University with the degree of master of the science of theology.

Doctor Johnson is not only the first colored man to serve as president but is one of the youngest college presidents in the country. He is only 37 years of age.

The wisdom of the choice of Doctor Johnson as president of Howard University may be conceded because of the fact that Col. Theodore Roosevelt was chairman of the committee which unanimously recommended his election. I prophesy that under the administration of President Johnson, Howard University will become one of the great educational institutions of the world. Let me say this to my Democratic colleagues, let us be fair to the Negro race. The so-called negro problem is not of their making. The black man is not here of his own volition. He was seized by force and brought unwillingly to a strange country where for generations he was your slave and where as a race he has since been compelled to eke out a meager and precarious existence.

I want to call your attention to the fact that after his emancipation, that he has made the most remarkable progress, mentally and industrially, of any race recorded in the annals of history. In the short period of 60 years he has emerged from slavery and has won his place in world leadership to-day. You will find the negro holding his place with his white brother in leadership, in science, in literature, music, art, finance, industry, and commerce. You will find negro leaders in all lines of human activity.

He has not only won and held his place in the business and professional world, but he makes the right kind of a citizen. He is patriotic and American to the very core of his character. Let us lay aside prejudice, pass this bill, and build up here in the National Capital a great institution for the colored race.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no authority for the legislation in question. The point of order is admitted by the chairman of the committee, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For equipment, supplies, apparatus, furniture, cases and shelving, stationery, ice, repairs to buildings and grounds, and for other necessary expenses, including reimbursement to the appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital of actual cost of heat and light furnished, \$80,000.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order to this paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have to admit that the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and equipment of a chemistry building, \$150,000; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such building and equipment at a cost not to exceed \$390,000.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order will have to be sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Howard University, \$390,000.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 45, line 9, for the purpose of offering an amendment as suggested in a memorandum from the Indian Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to return to page 45, line 9, for the purpose of offering an amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: Page 45, line 9, after the figures "\$10,000," strike out "for central heating plant, Seneca Indian School, Oklahoma, \$25,000," and insert in lieu thereof "for central heating plant and water supply, Seneca Indian School, Oklahoma, \$35,000."

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, without reading it, I have here a memorandum sent up to the chairman of the subcommittee having this bill in charge, justifying the increase of \$10,000 for water supply at the Seneca Indian School. There

is also a short letter, which I shall insert, addressed to my colleague, Mr. E. B. HOWARD, from the agent of that Indian reservation, in which he calls attention to the fact of the need of this appropriation and strongly urging that additional appropriation of \$10,000. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting these papers.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The memorandum and letter are as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE WATER SUPPLY, SENECA SCHOOL

With reference to the matter of water supply for the Seneca Boarding School under the Quapaw jurisdiction, Oklahoma, the facts before the office are, briefly, as follows:

With the object of further developing a water supply for the school, the superintendent recently caused a shallow well to be dug from which a supply of water, which the superintendent reports under date of December 16 last to be sufficient for all school purposes, has been obtained. However, while the water in this well has been tested by the State laboratory and pronounced safe for domestic use, the superintendent expresses fear that the water thus obtained comes originally from a neighboring creek, which has many sources of contamination. If this should prove to be the case, the present status of the water supply at the school must be regarded as by no means satisfactory, and measures to provide another supply free from the danger of contamination will be necessary. To that end the superintendent contemplates digging a deep artesian well. He has also in mind to re-lay water lines at the school and install certain other equipment which is needed for the system.

There have been two serious epidemics at the school, one in 1926 and again in the fall of 1927, which have been traced to the present water supply which leads into the creek before mentioned, which possibly feeds the new shallow well.

Some of the present water mains have been in use for 25 years. The estimated cost of digging a deep artesian well, re-laying the water mains, and installing the needed equipment is \$10,000.

MIAMI, OKLA., January 11, 1928.

Hon. E. B. HOWARD, M. C.:

Your letter 7th. Your understanding as to water system here correct. In fact, the recent epidemic of typhoid fever at this school was isolated directly to the present water supply and system. School physician and district supervising physician have recommended immediate change in entire water system. Suggest if possible a flat appropriation of \$10,000 be made to become immediately available to cover cost of drilling new deep well and otherwise properly provide for labor, general equipment, etc., necessary to the furnishing of proper water supply for this school. It has been estimated that this amount will be necessary for that purpose. Letter follows.

SUFFECCOOL.

MIAMI, OKLA., January 12, 1928.

INDIAN OFFICE,

Washington, D. C.:

Office wire 12th plan in mind is to drill deep artesian well and relay all water lines, some of which have been in use for 25 years; also install new needed equipment. This, it is believed, will furnish proper and adequate water supply if plan outlined by letter December 16th is carried out. Do not believe it will cost in excess of \$750. First analysis of water in experimental well showed safe, yet there is some belief that this water supply comes from Lost Creek, about 300 feet south, and if this is true, this water has many sources of contamination and will probably necessitate constant treatment. Letter follows.

SUFFECCOOL.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following further amendment to correct the total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: Page 44, line 24, strike out "\$38,000" and insert "\$398,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is necessary, but I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee are highly gratified that their work has met so fully with the approval of the House. This bill has been passed in record-breaking

time. I can account for it further only by the fact that we have a new member on the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], and I think he is a very effective mascot.

I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9136, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CRAMTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF HON. FINIS J. GARRETT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the speech delivered last night at the Jackson Day banquet at the Mayflower Hotel, in this city, by the distinguished leader of the minority the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. There is a little politics in it, of course, but nevertheless it is a very able document.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

Democracy is not a state of mind nor a psychological manifestation. It is a fundamental thing which lies deep in the human heart, and in its essence is of the profoundest philosophy of human life.

It does not spring from government; it underlies government, at least our Government.

Simply because man exists he is possessed of certain rights. They are coexistent with his birth and coextensive with his being. Government is merely to assure these rights and the highest functioning of government is that activity, or lack of activity, as necessity dictates, which preserves them.

Democracy is the antithesis of selfishness, and its constant danger is that it become the victim of greed. Because of its very nature it is surrounded always with enemies—enemies that are astute, alert, constantly organized, and ever watchful.

Because its character renders it unable to offer favors of law and enable one individual through legislative manipulation to profit at the expense of another, it does not, as an instrument of government, command the influence or elicit the support of special interests. It has to rely upon reason, upon justice, and make its appeal to the higher motives and the broader sympathies of mankind, and, unfortunately, these are not always in the ascendant.

These enemies, watchful and adroit, are masters of political warfare. Tactics, strategies, logistics—they possess them all, and never yet have they been found lacking in munitions.

They understand frontal attack and flank movement; when to strike and when to give the counterstroke. The value of espionage they recognized long ago, and above all things they appreciate the importance of creating dissensions and divisions in democracy's forces, and we are all too prone to divide.

In 1924, although they had no heavy artillery with which to bombard us, we nevertheless broke ranks before we had gotten close enough for them to see the whites of our eyes.

Is it possible, I wonder, that a great party, grounded in traditions of glory, a great party which has written nearly every permanent chapter of American law, is again to fall a victim to its own folly and blither about nonessentials, fight with passionate abandon over imaginary goblins and academic abstractions, and forget the substance which challenges our bravest and our best? Heaven forbid!

Surely in the conditions which surround us and which are observable upon the very surface, without even probing to the depths, we have glaring issues upon which to make successful appeal to the intelligence and virtue of America. In the favoritism which within seven short years has been wrought into law; in the tangled confusion following

in the wake of corruption and shame; in the foreign policy, or lack of foreign policy, which has left us without a friend among the nations of the world; in the domestic distresses which all their cunning has not enabled them to cure because avarice forbade alleviation; surely these things summon us to find a firm and common ground upon which the legions of democracy can stand and give lusty battle as in the victorious days of yore.

Democracy will not win grouped about a jumble of policies asserted as meeting the expediency of a fleeting hour. Democracy has won its fights when it had a battle flag which symbolized a system of principles fitted for the government of a free people in a republic (which is a democracy made practical) grounded upon a written constitution.

Democracy will never be destroyed; its philosophy too thoroughly permeates the world. And the party which espouses it stands in no danger of death from external forces. Its only danger lies within its own organism. It will not be killed, but it could commit suicide.

Democracy means respect for law and the implications of law; regard for the Constitution and the limitations of the Constitution; antagonism to governmental favoritism and the corrupting force of favoritism; enmity to privilege and the withering blight of privilege upon our institutions.

It means justice to the individual, and, therefore, peace among the masses.

The application of its principles by some party (for popular governments are administered only through the agency of party) constitutes the sole hope for the permanency of this democratic Republic.

Surely the Democratic Party—our Democratic Party—ought to be the one to apply democratic principles.

Its founder made it the instrumentality which rendered the Republic a democratic one. The man whose memory we honor this night revived it as it was about to become moribund and expanded it even beyond the hopes of its founder. A long line of illustrious leaders have followed them and carried on. Surely we of this demanding day will also carry on.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES PASSPORTS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting that section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," Sixty-ninth Congress, session 1, approved July 3, 1926, Public, No. 493, be amended so as to authorize the refund of passport fees erroneously collected otherwise than under the existing authority contained in that section.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State and I therefore request of the Congress legislation amending section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926, in the sense suggested.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 13, 1928.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State requesting that legislation be enacted to provide funds to cover the expense of this Government's participation in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference, to be held at Habana commencing March 31, 1928. The Secretary of State sets forth in his letter the reasons why it is considered advisable that the United States be represented at this conference.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State that this Government should participate in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference and therefore request of the Congress legislation appropriating \$5,000 for each and every expense connected with the representation of the United States at that conference, including travel, subsistence, or per diem in lieu thereof, in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), and compensation of employees as the Secretary of State shall consider necessary and authorize in his discretion.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 13, 1928.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BACON, for a few days, on account of illness.

REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS C. CRAMTON

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, less than 24 hours ago the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union began to consider under the five-minute rule the Interior Department appropriation bill. This bill contains 113 pages. A few minutes ago the bill was passed by the House of Representatives.

The chairman of the subcommittee that has reported the bill spoke of the appreciation of members of the subcommittee of the confidence reposed in the committee by the Members of the House. I want to say I am sure that the members of the subcommittee join with me when I tell you that the action of the House certainly was largely due to the confidence of the Members of the House in the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CRAMTON. [Applause.]

May I say further, the chairman of the subcommittee does not come from a State that has to do with reclamation, that has to do with Indian problems and with national parks, that has to do largely with the many public-land matters that have so much interest for the great western part of our country. Yet in his statement on yesterday to this House, as on previous occasions, our chairman indicated the profound knowledge that he has of all the subjects involved, knowledge not only of general policies and principles but of the multitude of details with which the appropriation bill for the Interior Department is concerned. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has obtained this knowledge through rare diligence, through untiring energy, and through painstaking persistency both during the sessions of the Congress and during the time when Congress has been in recess in studying the problems with which this committee has been charged. Mr. Speaker, the promptness with which this House has ratified the work of the Appropriation Committee is, as I take it, in large measure a manifestation on the part of the House of its appreciation of the industry, the honesty, and fidelity of our distinguished chairman in the job you have given him to do. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, as always, is unduly generous. [Applause.] I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the order previously made, the House adjourned until Monday, January 16, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, January 14, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.
Post Office Department appropriation bill.
District of Columbia appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.—caucus room)

To hear the Flood Commission of Pittsburgh and the Members of Congress from that city discuss projects to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

(2 p. m.—caucus room)

To hear members of the Mississippi River Commission discuss projects to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to discuss the building program.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact (H. R. 5773).

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(10 a. m.)

To authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (H. R. 5604).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

283. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting status and information relative to development of official plan for flood control, drainage, and irrigation, by J. L. Burkholder, chief engineer for Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, Albuquerque, N. Mex., November 12, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 141); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

284. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1927; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

285. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1929, to be immediately available, amounting to \$90,112.50 (H. Doc. No. 140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

286. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Raritan River, N. J., from natural deep water up to the west side of the Great Bend with a view to providing a suitable harbor with channel depth of 30 feet; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

287. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting statement of disbursement required by section 195, Revised Statutes, United States, during the period December 1, 1926, to November 30, 1927; statement of expenditures under all appropriations for the Bureau of Fisheries during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; statement of typewriter, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and statement showing travel performed by officers and employees to points outside of the District of Columbia on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures.

288. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Smiths Creek, in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

289. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Fowl River, Ala., with a view to securing a navigable channel of 8 feet depth and suitable width from Mobile Bay to a point about one mile above the highway bridge on the Cedar Point Road; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

290. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Mosquito Inlets, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

291. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

292. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Assateague Anchorage, Va., with a view to the establishment of a harbor of refuge; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HICKEY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9052. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of May 28, 1896; without amendment (Rept. No. 273). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9049. A bill to amend section 227 of the Judicial Code; without amendment, (Rept. No. 274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MORIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9202. A bill to authorize construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GARRETT of Texas: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8963. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Beier; with amendment (Rept. No. 275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FURLOW: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6916. A bill to correct the military record of Charles B. Holmes; without amendment (Rept. No. 276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8046) granting a pension to Lucy E. Riley, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 9278) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agriculture commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 9279) fixing the number of district judges for the southern district of California and providing for their appointment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 9280) authorizing the extension of time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LA GUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 9281) providing additional pay for submarine duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TATGENHORST: A bill (H. R. 9282) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899, by adding a new section thereto forbidding the deposit of noxious acids and acid materials in navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 9283) to promote the development, protection, and utilization of grazing resources on public lands, to stabilize the range stock-raising industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9284) to amend the immigration act of 1924 entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 9285) to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damage, personal injury, or death; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 9286) authorizing the appropriation of \$65,000 to be expended by the American section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, for the purpose of making a survey to fix the boundary between the United States and Mexico, between El Paso and Fort Quitman, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 9287) to authorize appropriations for construction at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 9288) to amend the packers and stockyards act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 9289) to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarine vessels and diving duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9290) to further amend an act, commonly known as the Elkins Act, entitled "An act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States," approved February 19, 1903, as heretofore amended by an act approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 9291) to create a commission to collect and publish the records of American women in war; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9292) to amend the organic law of the United States Court for China, enacted June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 9293) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Clinch River on the Sneedville-Rogersville road in Hancock County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma (by request): A bill (H. R. 9294) relating to the tribal and individual affairs of the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9295) to amend section 110, national defense act, so as to provide better administrative procedure in the disbursements for pay of National Guard officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 9296) to amend title 2 of an act approved February 28, 1925, regulating postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9297) authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Olympic National Forest, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9298) to prevent obstruction and burdens upon interstate trade and commerce in copyrighted motion-picture films, and to prevent the restraint upon the free competition in the production, distribution, and exhibition of copyrighted motion-picture films, and to prevent the further monopolization of the business of producing, distributing, and exhibiting copyrighted motion pictures, by prohibiting blind book and block booking of copyrighted motion-picture films and by prohibiting the arbitrary allocation of such films by distributors to theaters in which they or other distributors have an interest, direct or indirect, and by prohibiting the arbitrary refusal to book or sell such films to exhibitors in which they have no such interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 162) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 163) to create a commission to consider the practicability of establishing a system of tribunals for adjudicating controversies among the different governments of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREW: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) to complete historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol by a portrayal of the arrival of Charles A. Lindbergh on the field of Le Bourget in France; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) proposing an amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 91) relating to officers and employees and services of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 9299) granting an increase of pension to Emma Willits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 9300) for the relief of Joseph N. Marin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9301), for the relief of Hugh O'Malley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9302) granting a pension to Edgar M. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 9303) for the relief of Dent Allcroft & Co., A. J. Baker Co. (Inc.), Horwitz & Arbid (Inc.), and Richard Evans & Sons Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 9304) granting an increase of pension to Ella C. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9305) granting an increase of pension to Mary Matter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 9306) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Castle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 9307) granting a pension to James E. Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 9308) granting an increase of pension to Amanda C. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9309) to provide a preliminary survey of the Wabash River flowing through the State of Indiana, and along the southern boundary between the State of Indiana and the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9310) for the relief of R. H. Bohannon; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 9311) granting an increase of pension to Ella E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 9312) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Zebley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 9313) granting a pension to Frank J. Mesmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 9314) granting an increase of pension to Millie I. Croco; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9315) granting an increase of pension to Amanda F. Cotter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 9316) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9317) to correct the military record of Elijah Frisby (borne also as Elisha Frisbee and Elijah Frisbee); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9318) making Leona E. Kidwell eligible to receive the benefits of the civil service retirement act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 9319) for the relief of the Glens Falls Insurance Co., of Glens Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9320) for the relief of the Home Insurance Co. of New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 9321) granting a pension to Arnold M. Zirkle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9322) granting a pension to Richard Gregg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 9323) granting an increase of pension to Mary Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9324) granting an increase of pension to Isabell Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 9325) granting a pension to Marion Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9326) to reimburse Wm. Raskin & Co. (Inc.), of Brooklyn, N. Y., for losses amounting to \$15,000 sustained by them in 1918 and 1919 in the handling or dealing in or with wheat-flour substitutes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 9327) granting an increase of pension to Nettie C. Talbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 9328) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Wilhart Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9329) granting an increase of pension to Sylvia Carr Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9330) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9331) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9332) granting an increase of pension to Fidelity A. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9333) granting an increase of pension to Lenora Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 9334) for the relief of Morris J. Lang; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9335) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9336) granting a pension to John J. Boesl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9337) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Corder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9338) for the relief of Lillard Milling Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 161) to entitle John E. G. Blesell to petition for citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1536. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Charles H. Sanferd and seven others of Cranston, R. I., against passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1537. By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition by the officers of Topeka Post, No. 94, Woman's Relief Corps, Department of Kansas, urging the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War Veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1538. Also, petition by the officers of Topeka Post, No. 71, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, urging legislation to increase the pension of widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1539. Also, petition by citizens of Topeka, Kans., urging enactment of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1540. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, protesting against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1541. By Mr. BECK of Wisconsin; Petition of citizens of Minor Lake, State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to increase the pension of widows and soldiers of the Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1542. By Mr. BOHN: Petition by citizens of Boyne City, Mich., opposing House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1543. Also, petition of citizens of Charlevoix County, Mich., opposing House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1544. Also, petition by citizens of Emmet County, Mich., opposing House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1545. Also, petition by citizens of Antrim County, Mich., opposing House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1546. By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition in behalf of Civil War veterans and their widows, urging further relief legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1547. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1548. Also, petition against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1549. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of 70 citizens of Avery County, N. C., and 25 citizens of McAdenville and Belmont, N. C., against the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1550. By Mr. BURTNESS: Petition of 27 residents of Galesburg, N. Dak., urging retention of 1890 census as basis for immigration quotas; that the new quota distribution based on national origin be annulled; and that no further measures of reduction of Scandinavian quotas be passed by Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1551. Also, petition of five citizens of Fargo, N. Dak., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying adequate increases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1552. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Mrs. C. W. Buckley and 31 other residents of Mahtowa, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1553. Also, petition of residents of Duluth, Minn., urging action on a Civil War pension bill for the relief of veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1554. Also, petition of residents of Duluth, Minn., urging action on a Civil War pension bill for the relief of needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1555. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of citizens doing business with officials at the United States courthouse and post-office building, Brooklyn, N. Y., advocating the Welch bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1556. Also, petition of employees of the Government in advocacy of the Welch bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1557. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition from the citizens of Merrickville, N. Y., and vicinity, and from the citizens of Norwich, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1558. By Mr. CLAGUE: Petition of M. R. Martin, of Westbrook, Minn., and others, opposing the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1559. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of residents of Northville, N. Y., favoring increase of pensions to Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1560. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of citizens of Lockport, N. Y., protesting against the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1561. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of E. R. Latham and others, of Elliston, Mont., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1562. Also, petition of Edgar Lanham and other residents of Missoula, Mont., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1563. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of 325 persons, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1564. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 134 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the defeat of House bill 78, making Sunday observance compulsory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1565. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Mrs. Elmira M. Plimpton and various other citizens of East Brookfield, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1566. Also, letter of Adolph Blomstedt, of Springfield, Mass., submitting petition signed by 28 citizens of the third congressional district of Massachusetts (Belchertown, Enfield, Monson, and Ware), protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1567. Also, petition of Joseph Schnetzler and 652 other citizens of the third congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1568. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Maj. Gen. Walter E. Lombard (Massachusetts National Guard, retired), president National Guard Association of Massachusetts, 746 Old South Building, Boston, Mass., recommending amendment to section 113 of the national defense act to provide for annual national rifle matches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1569. By Mr. GARBBER: Petition of certain residents of the eighth congressional district of Oklahoma, urging the enactment of legislation to provide \$72 per month for every Civil War survivor, \$125 per month for every Civil War survivor requiring aid and attendance, and \$50 per month for every Civil War widow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1570. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Little Britain Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends, with regard to the building of cruisers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1571. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Dr. H. B. Boram and other citizens of South Bend, Ind., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1572. Also, petition of Mrs. Edith Cross and other citizens of South Bend, Ind., opposing the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1573. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of John Butts and 48 other residents of Grand Ledge, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1574. Also, petition of Mrs. George Sanders and 51 other residents of Kalamazoo County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1575. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of citizens of Belleville, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1576. By Mr. KIESS: Petitions from citizens of Galeton and North Bend, Pa., favoring legislation to increase the pension of Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1577. By Mr. KOPP: Petition signed by E. W. Graves and 60 other residents of Bentonport and Bonaparte, Iowa, and vicinity, protesting the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill in general and House bill 78 in particular; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1578. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 120 residents of Pope and Swift Counties, Minn., protesting against Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1579. Also, petition of several residents of Meeker County, Minn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1580. Also, petition of several residents of Meeker County, Minn., protesting against Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1581. Also, petition of several residents of Alexandria, Minn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1582. Also, petition of several residents of Willmar, Minn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1583. Also, petition of several residents of Big Stone and Stevens Counties, Minn., protesting against Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1584. Also, petition of several residents of Willmar, Minn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1585. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition signed by 161 citizens of Menasha, Wis., protesting against the passage of so-called Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1586. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of 49 citizens of Chillicothe, Mo., urging increase of pension allowances to soldiers of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1587. By Mr. MAAS: Petition of Dr. Henry H. Hall and 1,088 petitioners of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1588. Also, petition of August S. Anderson and 98 petitioners of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1589. By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Humansville, Mo., urging the passage of legislation providing increased pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1590. Also, petition of citizens of Saline County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation providing increased pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1591. Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Mo., urging the passage of legislation providing increased pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1592. Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1593. Also, petition of citizens of Sedalia, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1594. Also, petition of citizens of Cole Camp, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1595. Also, petition of citizens of Saline County, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1596. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of residents of Sparta, Mich., advocating the enactment of additional legislation for the benefit of veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1597. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Kiwanis Club, of Tucumcari, N. Mex., favoring House bill 8956, providing for the propagation of trees in the Great Plains area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1598. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of Peter Morton, of Minneapolis, and others, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1599. Also, petition of C. E. Powers and others, from Minneapolis, against Sunday compulsory observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1600. Also, petition of L. D. Ward and other Minneapolis citizens, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1601. Also, petition of Mrs. Nora Flockey, of Minneapolis, and others, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1602. Also, petition of Nels Berglund, of Minneapolis, and others, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1603. Also, petition of Mrs. E. J. Peterson, of Minneapolis, and others, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1604. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition of numerous citizens of Medford, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory

Sunday observance legislation and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1605. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Superior, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1606. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Clear Lake, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1607. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Clayton, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1608. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Brule, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1609. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Iron River, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1610. Also, petition of numerous citizens of South Range, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1611. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Tripoli, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1612. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Brantwood, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1613. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Three Lakes, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1614. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Eagle River, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1615. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Trego, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1616. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Spooner, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1617. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Rhinelander, Wis., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1618. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Keswick, Iowa, favoring increase of pension for soldiers of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1619. Also, petition of residents of Eddyville, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1620. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of residents of Celeron and Silver Creek, N. Y.; indorsing Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1621. Also, petition of residents of Jamestown, Olean, and Falconer, N. Y.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1622. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of D. C. Reynolds, E. M. Johnson, et al., of Queen City, Mo., in opposition to the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1623. Also, petition of Guy Newkirk, F. H. Bristow, and other residents of Macon County, Mo., protesting against the passage of legislation establishing compulsory Sunday observance, and particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1624. By Mr. SCHAFER: Petition signed by citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., and vicinity, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill or any other bill enforcing observance of the Sabbath, or any such resolution proposing such legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1625. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Mr. Ole Kleppe and 26 adult residents of Newfolden and Viking, Marshall County, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1626. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of numerous citizens of Bend, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the

Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1627. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Enterprise and La Grande, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1628. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1629. Also, petition of citizens of Escondido and San Diego County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1630. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1631. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1632. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1633. Also, petition of citizens of San Bernardino County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1634. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions of Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, indorsing the holding annually of the national rifle matches and urging the appropriation of the necessary funds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1635. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of Williamsburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1636. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition signed by residents of Pewamo, Mich., urging early action on a bill granting more liberal pensions to veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1637. Also, petition of 51 residents of the eighth congressional district of Michigan, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1638. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition of C. A. Stewart and other residents of Hot Springs, S. Dak., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1639. Also, petition of C. E. Perrin and other residents, of Custer, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1640. Also, petition of Camille W. Yuill and other residents, of Custer, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1641. Also, petition of G. R. McColley and other residents, of Edgemont, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1642. Also, petition of E. G. Olsen and other residents, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1643. Also, petition of J. E. Mueller and other residents, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1644. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of citizens of Midland, Ark., protesting against passage of Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1645. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of residents of various towns in Berkshire County, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, January 14, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting and power infinite, have mercy upon this whole land, and so guide the destiny of our Nation that the gentleness of Thy omnipotence may be tenderly revealed. Give us understanding hearts and discerning minds, that by our endeavors the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people may be advanced. Grant that by looking unto Thee our love may be rekindled and by waiting upon Thee our strength may be renewed. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.